DEO ADJUVANTE
NON
TIMENDUM

XAVIER UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
NEW ORLEANS, LA.

CLASS.
AUTH.
ACCES.

DONATED BY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/introductorystud0000edga

N
& Barbara

AN INTRODUCTORY STUDY
OF
THE FAMILY

Nihil Obstat

ARTHUR J. SCANLAN, S.T.D.
Censor Librorum

Imprimatur

✠ PATRICK CARDINAL HAYES
Archbishop, New York

NEW YORK
July 16, 1930

Xavier University Library
New Orleans, LA 70125

The Century Catholic College Texts
John A. Lapp, Editor
Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Ph. D., Associate Editor for Philosophy
George N. Shuster, A. M., Associate Editor for English

AN INTRODUCTORY STUDY OF THE FAMILY

BY

EDGAR SCHMIEDELER, O. S. B., PH. D.
Professor of Sociology at St. Benedict's College
Atchison, Kansas

D. APPLETON-CENTURY COMPANY
INCORPORATED
New York *London*

COPYRIGHT, 1930, BY THE CENTURY CO.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED, INCLUDING THE
RIGHT TO REPRODUCE THIS BOOK, OR
PORTIONS THEREOF, IN ANY FORM. 421

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

173
Sch3i

To

MY PARENTS

In Remembrance of

Their Golden Jubilee

PREFACE

The subject of the family is receiving much attention to-day. As an ancient microcosm it is commented upon extensively both in the written and the spoken word. Particularly interested is the serious social student. Many claim to see alarming symptoms of disease and disintegration in the triune group of father, mother, and immediate offspring. Even the term "domestic revolution" is heard. Some, in fact, predict the eventual total subversion of the monogamous ideal of family life.

Undoubtedly the modern family is having its reverses and the outlook seems, at times, anything but bright to those who revere the family and wish it to continue as a unit of society. Even the Catholic family, although left relatively untouched by divorce, has suffered much in recent decades. It functions with ever-increasing difficulty, and frequently its purposes are, at least in part, defeated. The great iron economic forces of our machine age have, on the one hand, been lined up against it, and, on the other, the pagan ideals of the day have threatened, if not actually weakened it.

The distinction given the family by Christianity, its long history, and its many vital services to the race, warrant the great importance assigned to the family and justify the interest, and even the alarm excited because of its present disturbed condition. Its importance has ever been recognized by the Church, and she has taken an active interest in the well-being of family life. She may well renew her efforts in behalf of the home to-day and, particularly so, by looking more to her school system for assistance in reconstructing and conserving the domestic realm. Attention to this subject in the secondary schools and, more particularly, perhaps, in seminaries and in the increasing number of girls' colleges, should not only be appropriate but also highly commendable. It is to encourage the study of the family through the medium of the school that the writer has undertaken this introductory work. He has, however, in the preparation of the volume, also tried to keep in view the pastor and the parent. An effort has been made to picture the general family situation, but, unlike the average sociological treatise, this places considerable stress upon the influence of the Church and of religion upon the family.

The volume is divided into three parts: (1) Family Integration, devoted chiefly to the family of the past; (2) Family Disintegration, portraying the modern disorganized domestic situation; (3) Family Re-integration, giving some suggestions for familial reform.

The writer has embodied in the text some material taken from his earlier work, *The Industrial Revolution and the Home*. Further fact and theory have been drawn from many sources, and my indebtedness for whatever cannot be said to have become the common possession of sociologists is expressed in the references appearing in the text.

I wish to acknowledge the helpful suggestions received from Dr. John M. Cooper, of the Catholic University of America, from Leonard Schwinn, O. S. B., Virgil Stallbaumer, O. S. B., Celestine Bache, O. S. B., and David Kinish, O. S. B., of St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kansas, and from Cornelius Caples, O. S. B., of St. Benedict's Maur Hill, Atchison, Kansas. The author, however, accepts responsibility for anything presented in the following pages.

EDGAR SCHMIEDELER, O. S. B.,

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

During the last few years a number of books have appeared on the problems of the modern family. Innumerable articles in magazines and in conference proceedings have borne testimony to an awakened interest in the subject. Coincidentally the growth of family social work has tended to emphasize the supreme importance of safeguarding the family as the basis of our civilization. In 1927 occurred the great conference, at Buffalo, of family welfare societies commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the beginning of organized community work for the repair of breaking or broken families.

There is today a clear recognition on the part of all people who weigh social consequences, of the need for the study of the effect upon the family of present day social, economic and spiritual life. Far from being a disheartening outlook, those who view the subject broadly see that whatever losses the family may have suffered under modern strains seem in a fair way to be made up by gains in unexpected places. Those who see the losses and not the gains are bound to be gloomy for the family prospects. On the other hand, those who weigh the gains against the losses are likely to be hopeful that the family is too deeply rooted to be seriously menaced. A candid examination will disclose, too, that many of the evils are preventable.

When we look at the long history of mankind and realize that everywhere and at all times the family has existed, and when we see it everywhere today, among uncivilized and civilized peoples alike, it must be taken as a proof not only of its everlasting character but also that it is a part of the Divine plan for the propagation and protection of the human race.

The great significance of the subject may well urge social scientists to the study of the many and difficult problems of family life under present day conditions.

The writer of this volume brings to the study and presentation of the subject the kind of equipment necessary to a broad and sympathetic understanding. A student of social problems, a special investigator of the economic side of family life, a college teacher, and a clergyman of the Catholic Church—these are guarantees of an approach to the subject along a broad highway.

The book is intended for use in college courses but the subject and the treatment should commend it to a wide range of readers and students in all walks of life.

John A. Lapp.

CONTENTS

PART I

FAMILY INTEGRATION

CHAPTER PAGE

I Family Bonds 5
II The Church and the Family 25
III The Church and the Family (Continued) . 41
IV The Family and the Social Organism . . . 57

PART II

FAMILY DISINTEGRATION

V Roots of Modern Social Change 78
VI The Industrial and Social Revolution . . 91
VII The Family and Its Workers Affected . . 108
VIII Women Workers and the Family 123
IX The Modern Home and Leisure Time . . . 138
X The Changed Status of Husband and Wife . 151
XI Perversions of Love 166
XII Family Tensions 183
XIII Broken Homes 202

PART III

FAMILY RE-INTEGRATION

XIV Pre-Marital Preparation 227
XV The Qualifications of a Mate 243
XVI Legal Safeguards of Marriage 262
XVII Education and the Family 283
XVIII The Church and Family Re-Integration . . 306
XIX Modern Family Resources 327
XX The Home as an Educational Agency . . . 352

Index 377

PART I

FAMILY INTEGRATION

AN INTRODUCTORY STUDY OF THE FAMILY

FAMILY INTEGRATION

The one social institution upon which society depends most intimately is the family. This cell, as it were, of the social organism is necessary for both the existence and the well-being of the human race. But the satisfactory fulfilment of its purposes depends upon its inherent integration, or, in other words, upon its homogeneity and stability. Because of this fact, we of this fluid and unstable age may well seek to learn anew wherein family solidarity consists. It is highly important that we learn what forces tend to integrate family groups. Furthermore, it is of the greatest moment that we know what bonds bind this little world into a permanent and unified whole. Both social evolution and the history of the race itself can help supply this information. An analysis shows the many and varied threads woven into the family fabric to insure its integrity. Manifold, indeed, are the elements that go to make up the family complex.

Among primitive peoples the anthropologist commonly finds a fairly integrated familial life—a very strikingly integrated one among those of most primordial cultures. The very pressure of circumstances in the hard life of primitives makes familial integration a necessity for survival. Consequently, a well-organized family life may be expected among them, quite aside from any influence that ideals or convictions of a religious nature may exert upon them.

In civilized life, as history shows, the family may very seriously disintegrate, and this fact leads even to the ruin of nations. But, on the other hand, the very highest type of integrated family life can be found also on the higher planes of civilization. Undoubtedly the best example of this phenomenon is the family of the Middle Ages. Professor Ogburn states: "It is possible that during the past two or three thousand years in Europe the family as a functioning agency reached the highest point which it has ever attained."[1] More specifically does history show the family of the Middle Ages to have been most highly integrated. And since the medieval family is the particular type of institution from which our own modern family has sprung, we may well give it somewhat detailed attention, with the hope of discovering the influences that gave it stability. This knowledge should, in turn, give us light and guidance of considerable service in dealing with our own unstable family situation.

Perhaps the most outstanding characteristics of the medieval period were that the masses devoted their efforts to the cultivation of the fields; that the higher classes gave their attention rather to the fine arts than to science and commerce, and that the civilization in which all Europeans participated was thoroughly Christian. From this arrangement sprang the integrated family of the time. This medieval family, in turn, had been builded in part out of the pagan Greco-Roman family and in part out of that of the barbarian invaders of Europe. It has continued down to very recent times and is found in a large measure even today. While our attention will in this treatise on the integrated family be more particularly directed toward the medieval familial group itself, the family organization of the peoples who preceded and came after will not be entirely overlooked.

[1] Ogburn, W. F., "Our Social Heritage," *Survey*, Dec. 1, 1927, p. 276.

CHAPTER I

FAMILY BONDS

Among the different major forces that helped integrate the family group during the medieval period were: the bonds of the family itself; the social organism or community in which the fundamental social unit was ingrained; and the Church, whose influence over the home-life was considerably greater than that of any other social institution.

Among the various bonds that served to hold the little domestic world together were the affectional, the industrial and economic, the recreational, the protective, the educative, the authoritative, and the religious. Undoubtedly the most natural and fundamental of all these bonds is that of love, or affection. Others are largely ministrant to this one.

Affection as a family Bond.—Affection is one of the primary instincts of our nature. The sensible affection of parent for offspring and of offspring for parent is evident throughout the whole animal creation. Some animals will suffer death rather than neglect their young. If this is true of the lower creation, how much more is it not true of man, raised so much higher and endowed with a free and intelligent will, as the means by which to enjoy a more perfect love and affection. Love is, in fact, the unmistakable polar star guiding the formation of families. But it radiates its greatest and fullest splendor only when children come into the home and blossom forth into men and women under parental care and guidance. It would indeed be hazardous not to consider love a prerequisite for marriage. Home-life involves many compromises and no small number of sacrifices. These, it is true, can be made without love, but in this case they are harder to make and are in reality less often made. Affection primarily provides the motive leading parents to put forth their greatest effort in behalf of their children.

The Elements of Affection Distinguished.—The elements that usually blend in family life are often confused one with another, and the term *love* is, in a wide sense, applied to all of them. But in reality three elements can well be distinguished: passion, parental impulse, and affection. These, while standing alone, are of no distinct moral value; a normal interplay, however, of all three, as afforded by family life, promotes a healthy domestic condition.

Passion, or the mating instinct, signifies the mere physical side of sex. It is an intermittent phenomenon and is primarily, if not exclusively, self-centered. Affection, exclusive of both passion and the parental impulse, consists in a mutual attraction between two individuals. It is a complex thing in which we can distinguish qualities such as desire for companionship, sympathy, devotion, constancy, chivalry, and self-sacrifice. The parental impulse is scarcely less complex. Primarily, however, it manifests itself in the desire for children and in self-sacrificing care, protection, and love of offspring.

With regard to their social value, it is well to note that passion and love's desire for companionship and exclusive possession are primarily self-centered or egotistic. They help to lead people into marriage, but standing alone and unsupported in family life, they become a disintegrating and centrifugal force. The parental impulses and the constancy and devotion of love to the one loved, on the contrary, are centripetal forces in family life. Love proper, from its very nature, tends to bind. It is naturally reciprocal, consisting in a mutual attraction between two. Yet, even such inchoate or root love, founded in the companionship of husband and wife and in their altruistic spirit of self-sacrifice for each other, tends to blend with some elements of egotism. The full realization of ideal love is found only in the triune relation of father, mother, and child. This full love is impossible without the awakening of the parental impulse. Such ideal love can be found only in the family. More than anything else does it integrate the family group. In this devotion of father and mother to their offspring we have the triumph of the unselfish over the selfish part of our nature. In it the mutual love of husband and wife is enriched and deepened. Without it the home is incomplete.

The Interplay of the Elements of Affection.—While the three elements of passion, affection, and parental impulse can be distinguished, they should, however, be found combined in normal family life. Even the more selfish qualities can serve a good purpose when not isolated from the rest. "The interplay of these several factors in marriage and domestic life," says Dr. Cooper,[2] "is a part of a wondrous and kindly divine strategy by which the selfish hungers and self-regarding trends in love itself are made use of and built upon by God for the propagation of the human race, the education of the child, the sanctification of the human home, and the training of parents themselves in unselfishness. The motives and forces that impel men and women to marry and found homes are more commonly passion or love's desire for companionship, that is, the selfish or self-regarding factors. But marriage itself and home-making are of their very nature sacred and unselfish; they fulfil unselfish tasks, and train mates in the practice of unselfishness. Through marriage love of self is as it were changed by a divine alchemy into love of neighbor, and egotistic forces are turned into altruistic channels. . . . The unselfish love between husband and wife is sustained, fed, and further purified by their common sacrificial and unselfish devotion to and care of their children. . . . Marriage, home-making, and child-bearing are therefore a life-long and consecrated training in labor for God and neighbor."

---

[2] Cooper, J. M., *Religion Outlines For Colleges*, Course I, pp. 108–109.

The Chivalrous Romanticism of the Middle Ages.—Affection is most closely allied with romanticism. The term "romantic" is rather a broad one, but in general it is taken to imply that which is extreme, unexpected, and unique, rather than that which is ordinary, normal, or conventional. The romantic impulse is a trait of human nature that normally enters into and colors the individual's ordinary life activities. It is found in greater measure during the period of youth, blossoms forth with the emergence of adolescence, and reaches greatest heights in the idealized love of courtship.

In some shape or form this inveterate trait of romanticism shows itself in the different periods of history. In the Middle Ages we find it a most beneficial adjunct to family life. Thus, Goodsell[3] only agrees with a host of other authorities when she says that it reached its highest and most ideal form of spiritual love during the chivalrous twelfth and thirteenth centuries. "There grew up in those centuries of bloodshed and plunder, of oppression of the weak by the strong, the sentiment of romantic love. Rare indeed in pagan civilizations, almost unknown at the dawn of the Middle Ages, it was destined to spread over the whole of Christendom and to prove a great civilizing influence. For, when the lady comes to set a spiritual price upon her love and favor, when the knight willingly pays that price in brave devotion and courteous service, then love has risen from a purely sensual plane and has become an affair of the heart and of the mind." And the same writer urges us "not to ignore the tremendous significance of the chivalric movement in planting in the souls of men a respect and consideration for womanhood, a willingness to serve woman, and some appreciation of the profound gulf between ideal love and brute lust." While this spirit was abroad it prompted its subjects to cultivate the more spiritual phases of love. It created within the souls of the more noble-minded men and women a realization of the true nature of ideal affection. And where this higher and spiritual love relation was found it served not only to integrate the family but also to lift the whole home-life to higher planes. Undoubtedly, even in the Middle Ages there were cases of romanticism that did not square with these higher ideals, instances that amounted to mere fantastic and artificial insincerity, and in course of time the whole movement degenerated. From a highly integrated force in family life, it became no less a disintegrating influence to the home. Romantic love was eventually altogether dissociated from orthodox marriage and showed itself in attachments between courtier and courtesan rather than in the ideal relations of husband and wife. This was particularly the case in the royal courts of seventeenth-century France and Italy. The relations became much similar to those of Athenian Greek toward the Hetairae of their time.

---

[3] Goodsell, W., *The Family as a Social and Educational Institution*, pp. 227–228.

Romanticism in America.—In the earlier days of our own country romantic love was generally but a prologue of marriage. It paralleled courtship which normally terminated in a marriage where the earlier idealized love emotion gradually grew into the deep and stable affection of family life. There was, of course, the usual element of make-believe and an atmosphere of fiction in courtship that is but normal to the human being at this stage of life. But courtship was taken seriously and was continued sufficiently long to permit the intense emotional upheaval to subside somewhat, so that the two lovers could calmly distinguish that which was genuine from that which was unreal, and could separate the fictitious qualities from those really characteristic of each other. Having first come down somewhat from their ethereal super-level and really tested each other they could make the transition from idealized love to deep and abiding marital affection without undue hazard. And the change went a great way in integrating the home-life of the time. This did not mean that newly-wed persons immediately settled down to a humdrum routine that chilled all affection and caused the finer attitudes of courtship to take flight. Settling down to the task of starting their home gave them many common interests in which to center their attention and served to draw them together in even closer comradeship. By means of a little thought and attention, if not even automatically and by very force of circumstances, many little ways were found by which life was kept interesting and affection was constantly fed and enriched. And, as was customary, there was soon the first child, that awakened the parental impulses and deepened marital love the more. Thus, the transition was completed. The feverish romantic drive that had impelled toward marriage, gradually passed over into the serene calm of well-adjusted married life.

While this was the normal situation in early agricultural America, there were undoubtedly exceptions. In the case where husband and wife were natural day-dreamers, given from childhood to much castle-building and constantly to dodging difficulties instead of facing them, they naturally lacked the courage and character necessary for success in married life as well as for any other relationship. Character and control are positively essential in the individual as a basis for satisfactory family life. But these requisites were commonly found. Life was not organized on a pleasure basis in those early days. Times were hard. Work was stressed and responsibilities taken seriously. Fancy readily surrendered to fact. And even in the exceptional cases there were social forces at work that commonly kept the union a permanent one, and that brought a quiet pressure which gradually caused the highly-wrought idealists to descend to earth and to accept the responsibilities of normal family life.

All the activities of daily life, religion, work, play—all may serve to feed and foster family affection. They may serve to increase the regard and respect of children for their parents. They may provide a ready means for child-training. And they may integrate the home by serving more directly as bonds that bind together the little domestic world. A number of these bonds deserve special attention.

WORK AND FAMILY INTEGRATION

Industrial and Economic Bonds.—The work of the masses during the Middle Ages centered in the cultivation of the fields. In other words, the chief culture of the time was agriculture. For many this has continued even down to the present time. It is a system of work or kind of culture that quite automatically tends to integrate home life. In the rural past we see this integrating power in its fullest extent. A significant description of the situation, as found in England in 1725, is left us by Daniel Defoe.[4] "Though we met few people out of Doors," he wrote, "yet within we saw the Houses full of lusty Fellows, some at the Dye-vat, some at the loom, others dressing the Cloths; the women and children carding and spinning; all employed from the youngest to the oldest; scarce anything above four years old, but its hands were sufficient for its own support."

There is no doubt that, in general outline and even in much detail, the same picture, less than a hundred years ago, would have applied to very many families of this country. The work of the members was normally centered in and about the home. The homespun and other industries were found there. The mother was the center of the domestic economy. The father, whether in the home or in the field, was always near at hand. Under such circumstances family life rested on an industrial basis that naturally made for unity. The interests of the workers were largely centered in the home. The possibilities of the situation for the family and its members are well brought out in the words of Helen Bosanquet [5] describing the industrial coöperation of the agricultural family. "The typical family community is one which is held together by a common industry in which everyone can partake, according to his strength and capacity; and the industry which most readily lends itself to the coöperation of a number of persons of different age and sex is farming and the cultivation of the land. In it there is work for all capacities; the weakest can contribute something, the most stupid can give his strength, and the most able can find scope for his skill and organizing power. . . . This industrial unity of a family means that its members are stronger in combination than they would be apart. A real gain is effected by the assignment of work to those most fitted to do it, and thus there is a genuine economic force to hold the family together.'' Undoubtedly, where the efforts and interests of the members of the little family group were so absorbed and merged in the common promotion of the family welfare, there developed strong familial bonds because of the mutual dependence and help that each contributed to the other. The well-being of the individual under the circumstances became quite secondary to the general welfare of the family group. The industrial interests of the family workers were identical. Their homes were industrial units. And their homes were economic units as well. Few, if any, worked away from home for separate pay. Even the youngest was an economic asset to the home. Economically and industrially there was an interdependence and spirit of mutual help which held the family members together. Naturally such a system of coöperation and economic mutuality fostered strong familial feelings as well as love for the home and for each other. It made for domestic solidarity. It integrated the home.

---

[4] De Foe, D., *A Tour Thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain*, Vol. III, pp. 137–139.

[5] Bosanquet, H., *The Family*, pp. 195–196.

Even today there is considerable evidence of the unifying force of the industrial and economic bonds in family life in rural parts of America. It is also worthy of note even in the case of the artisan and small shopkeeper of the Middle Ages, that his work centered in and about the home, much as did that of his rural contemporary. In all these cases the children, in and about the home, were within range of the mother's observing eye, within reach of her tender care. There was almost continuous contact between parent and child.

Child-training could be carried on informally in connection with ordinary daily work. For all practical purposes no more effective and satisfactory method has been found. Thus the situation was very favorable for the fulfilment of the primary functions of home life.

PLAY AND FAMILY INTEGRATION

The Integrating Power of Play.—Play, too, where found within the home circle, tends to integrate the family group, just as it normally unites any group in which it makes its power felt. Play arouses sentiments common to all, thus serving as a powerful agency to secure effectively the unity of thought, feeling, and purpose that binds the members to a group. If all common interests in the home serve as familial bonds, the common interests of enthusiastic play will likely be of the nature of stronger bonds, the lively sentiments once aroused, will serve to cement other ties. Particularly does play serve to enrich familial love and to strengthen the affectional tie.

Our educational leaders sense the integrating and binding power of play, and use it to advantage in the school group of to-day. It is largely through play that they try to develop the spirit of the group. It is the underlying factor in the present-day development of the so-called ''school spirit'' and the ''college spirit.''

In the army group the officer realizes this peculiar value of play, and hence feels that the amusements and recreations of the troops should come from within the army, at least not wholly from without. He feels it would make for a spirit of loyalty to officer and group. Will there not be a divided allegiance, to say the least, if the disagreeable orders come from one source and the good things from another? If the recreation of the troops is within the control of the officer, he can make use of the same to counteract the bad taste left, perhaps, by disagreeable tasks he had to demand of the men.

The same principle operates in the home. The child will hardly develop a spirit of loyalty to its parents if it knows them only in the role of taskmasters and never as the dispensers of the things that appeal to the child. If the home is only a place for "do this" and "don't do that," it will not be attractive to the child. It would take a capable parent to make a home, divorced from the joys and interests of play, inviting to a child. On the other hand, perhaps nothing else can so infallibly draw out and cultivate the child's loyalty to parents as a home-spirit intensified through an emotional setting of play. Play is the dominant interest of the child. And this interest readily cultivates the love of family members. It does much to cement familial ties.

Play and the Home of the Past.—In the days that preceded the growth of our gigantic modern cities, play centered in and about the home far more than it does to-day. In rural Western States, for instance, one can still meet old pioneers, and more frequently their children of the second generation, who tell of the various neighborhood "bees" that furnished in earlier times so much amusement and recreation for the rural districts. The literature, descriptive of the times, also speaks of the "log-rolling," "corn-husking," "barn-raising," "spelling," and other "bees" of pioneer days. When neighbors came together to help some family clear a field of stones or logs, to raise the heavy walls of a new house, or to husk corn, it was a singular host indeed who did not regale the workers and their families with a repast of the best he could offer, and with amusement in the form of a barn dance, music, story-telling—something to interest all, young and old alike. In this manner the homes of rural America became quite important recreation centers for the families of the immediate neighborhood. There were other gatherings, too, usually under parental chaperonage. There were the programs of the country school and church. By far the greater part of the leisure time, however, was spent in and around the home place. Even at the gatherings mentioned, the whole family was usually present. Commercialized recreation, as we have it today, was unknown. Recreation was not inspired from without. It came from within the community. It was home-made.

There was undoubtedly an intimate connection between the situation described and the intense home life of the time. It can be little doubted either that their exciting "bees" also did much to foster the traditional neighborhood spirit so typical of the American pioneers.

This situation not only integrated home life, but it also made simple provision for parental supervision. The child was assured protection from dangers, especially to morals, which it might meet with elsewhere.

Again, there was the close relation between home recreation and the vital function of the family, namely, the training of the child. Opportunity was afforded for the same informal and effective training that was noted in connection with the work of the child. It is at play that the child is most itself and shows its real nature. The parents, from constant and intimate contact with the child, get a keen insight into his character. They can readily note any outcropping of unsocial qualities and thus administer due correction. Leisure time, furthermore, was limited. Hence a little extra amusement became a real treat which parents could readily use as a reward either for faithful work or for good conduct. It is doubtful whether the parents saw any value in play other than a means of keeping the children occupied and out of harm's way. To accustom the child gradually to work, however, was considered essential. But it was the combination of both work and play under the direction of the parents that made these homes preëminent forces in the training of the children, inasmuch as both helped to integrate the group and to provide continuous contact between parent and child. If there was any danger at all in the situation, it was rather that the family would become too exclusive and ingrowing.

Similar in many ways must have been the situation in medieval Europe. There was the same opportunity for home recreation and even more for community recreation than fell to the lot of the American pioneer. While there were no large cities, medieval peoples lived less in isolation than did the American farmer. Even those who cultivated the fields lived together extensively in village-like groups. Their parish church grounds, their village "greens" or manorial "commons" were in great part the community centers of recreation. Moreover, the guilds of the times and the many legalized Church holy days did much to encourage, under due supervision, neighborhood recreation and sociability.

AUTHORITY AND FAMILY INTEGRATION

Work and play can do much to foster love and to integrate the home. Love itself should be the fundamental basis of familial control. Yet, authority in the domestic world is likewise necessary. It adds a more positive note to the other bonds that serve to hold the group in unison. Even as work and play, so can authority be a tool of love. But it can also be used in tyrannical fashion. Authority in itself is, beyond any doubt, a good thing. It is necessary not only in the family but in every other social group. Its strongest basis, however, will ever be a loyalty which responds to a wise and generous rule. In some form or other authority will always be found in a well-organized and integrated home. And, normally, it makes for family unity and solidarity. A brief glimpse at the family of various periods of history will make this contention clear. Very generally in the past a highly centralized authority has ever exerted an integrating influence in the domestic microcosm. This authority was customarily centered in the father or eldest male member of the group. The type of family created by this system was known as the patriarchal family. It placed firmly at the center of the social order the power and responsibility of the man. This system prevailed very generally in historic times.

The Patriarchal Roman Family.—The patriarchal family that has perhaps been given most attention is the Roman familial unit. The father's authority was known as the *patria potestas.* The term, of course, means the power of the father, just as "patriarchal" signifies rule by the father. According to the usual custom the authority was vested in the eldest living male of the family group. Contrary to Greek custom, the Roman power endured permanently, lasting throughout the life of the patriarch. In Rome under the kings it was at its height and extended equally over young and old. "The Roman father of the period," says Devas,[6] "had unlimited power of chastising and slaying. . . . The Roman religion only prohibited exposure of male children and the first-born female, but not of the other female children." The power of the father, extending to life and death, was expressly recognized by the laws of the Twelve Tables, compiled about 450 B. C. This early Roman family was a closely integrated group. It was a legal, economic, and religious unit. The patriarch was the one "person" in the group recognized by the law. All legal rights were vested in him. So, too, were all economic rights centered in the patriarch as the recognized sole owner of the family property. And greater still was his authority because of his position as priest for the family ancestor worship. This made the father a quasi-link between the living and the deceased members of the family. He alone knew the ceremonials by which the ancestral spirits might be appeased, and he alone could pass this knowledge to the eldest son. In this way the Roman religious superstitions acted as a powerful stimulus to preserve the integrity of the family. In truth, the early Roman family was very much a religious institution, with ancestor worship as its basic principle, and the father's position as priest in the family worship was the chief source of his extensive authority. Many functions that are to-day in the hands of the church and state were then centered

[6] Devas, C., *Studies in Family Life*, p. 27.

in the home. Moreover, these functions were controlled by the one sole head of the household. This order must have resulted, also, in much domestic unhappiness for wife and children. It was a tremendous power to put into the hand of any one individual, subject only to a pagan régime that left passions undisciplined and authority unchecked.

In later imperial times the Roman family disintegrated. It became in many ways a counterpart of the individualistic family of to-day. The decay went hand in hand with the destruction of the domestic religion and the corresponding growth of skeptical philosophy. During their career of ruthless conquest their ancient cry, ''For our altars and for our hearthstones,'' had little real significance for the Romans. Even before the dawn of Christianity the paternal power had greatly waned.

The Patriarchal Chinese Family.—Even in relatively modern times we find the patriarchal family in full vigor and portraying its unifying power in home-life. Writing as late as 1886, Devas[7] says of the authority of the Chinese father: ''Short of life and death, there is scarce any limit to it; and he is not severely dealt with if his child die under the punishment he inflicts; while the slaughter or exposure of infant children is a common practice towards female infants, not in all China, but in large portions of it, and is only forbidden or reprobated in certain localities. . . . Children, moreover, never outgrow parental authority; their marriage is regulated for them without it being necessary to consult them. And, indeed, at an age when they are too young to be trusted to make a reasonable choice; and a marriage without consent of the parents is void.'' Devas claims for the Chinese family a permanence that is unexampled in history. Certainly their whole culture has been strikingly stable. Their very system of education helped to keep it so. The result is reflected in the stability of their family life. Moreover, their family integrity was founded in the peculiar constitution of their domestic group, particularly in their ancestor worship and the rules of inheritance. All is centered in the patriarchal head. It was ultimately the patriarch's authority that was the greatest integrating force in the household unit.

---

[7] Devas, C., *op. cit.*, p. 8.

The Jewish Patriarch.—Many other examples of patriarchal families like those of the Romans and of the Chinese might be chosen from history. There is special reason, however, why particular mention should also be made here of the Jewish system of old. The scriptural patriarchs also had vast powers centered in their hands as heads of households. In many ways the relations of Hebrew parents and children were, in fact, similar to those of the Chinese. Yet, in actual use of power there was a vast difference. The Jewish patriarch was restrained in the use of his power. He could not use it arbitrarily. Infanticide, for instance, was altogether forbidden. Ancestor worship was held to be idolatrous. Then, too, his worship of the one true God tempered his authority with conjugal love and parental affection. While the state left his powers considerably unrestricted, the laws of God limited them very definitely. Herein, of course, lay the great and all-important distinction between the Jewish and the pagan patriarchal authority. In neither did the state noticeably limit the patriarchal authority. But in the case of the Jewish patriarch there was the far greater influence of the law of God that protected the members of the household from the abuse of an unrestricted authority. In the case of the Roman father this limitation was lacking. Moreover, according to a number of historians, the impulse of cruelty was rather highly developed in the Roman. Particularly did many of the upper-classes become a prey to selfishness, cruelty, luxury, and other inherent baser traits, and then parental and marital, as well as every other species of authority, was more or less grossly abused. Such were little restricted by the law of either God or man. On the other hand there is no question that the moral and religious restraints flowing from the worship of the true God and the observance of his law, and the tender and loving disposition nurtured by the religion of the chosen people of old, afforded ample protection to the wife and child of the Jewish household—far more ample, in fact, than any civil law can afford.

Authority in the Christian family was also tempered, like that of the Jews, by means of religion. The old law was not set aside but perfected by Christ. The Church, the organized expression of Christianity, zealously sought to inculcate the Christian ideal in the application of authority in the home as in other social groups. Through its efforts authority became based more and more upon foundations of love and loyalty. This attitude made it a powerful family bond indeed—a veritable cement that united the family members in closest harmonious unison. Thus, while serving the customary purpose of training children and promoting the due order of the household, it also made for fullest integrity of family life. Further attention will be given this subject in a succeeding chapter, in which the Church's view regarding the relations of family members towards one another will be considered. Considerable space will also be devoted there to the influence of the Christian religion upon home life in general.

RELIGIOUS AND OTHER FAMILY BONDS

Religion in general must be given at least passing mention here as a bond of family life. Social evolution and history alike show the striking part it played in the integration of the home-life of different peoples of the race. Wherever it entered vitally into the family life of a people, it served as a powerful family bond tending to unite the group. Its influence in upholding and strengthening parental authority has been noted. But in other ways, too, it made felt its integrating power. Intertwining, as it were, the other familial ties, it revitalized and quickened them, thus strengthening the family fabric and making for cohesion among the members of the domestic microcosm. In early stages of culture, for instance, we find that the family and all familial relations were submitted not only to religious influence, but were also essentially of a religious nature. Often the very links of kinship were looked upon as primarily mystical, and physical only secondarily. Even those who to-day deny the need of religion in the home must admit that it has ever been found in some shape or form as a home influence among all peoples of history. We have already noted the close relationship between the disintegration of the Roman family and the decay of its spiritual ties, or the breakdown of its ancestor worship.

There were still other bonds that during feudal times in Europe, for instance, served to integrate family life. By no means least among these was education. What the modern calls industrial training and elementary schooling was all cared for by the home in the case of the vast majority of medieval people. For them the home was also the school. This informal domestic training was not only effective, but also served greatly to enhance the prestige of the home. It added much to group solidarity.

The protective function of the home served as another family bond. Protection of cottage or castle, of women and children, fell almost exclusively to the lot of the father during the age of untutored barbarism and but half-disciplined brute force that followed the fall of the Roman Empire. This largely remained the case during all the centuries that preceded the organization and development of modern nations with their systems of public control and protection. This particular task of protecting the house and its inmates was very closely linked with man's authority in the home. In very large part, in fact, the highly centralized familial authority of the times was demanded by the civilization of the day.

All these different family bonds—the affectional, the industrial and economic, the recreational and authoritative, the educational, protective, and religious—served in the past, as they do wherever found today, to bind the group into close and unbroken unity. They forced upon the family, as it were, many and varied functions. There was little danger indeed, in the agricultural civilization of medieval Europe, that the home would be robbed of its functions and so weaken and decay. Its many and varied activities kept the domestic microcosm a vital functioning unit. They provided its members with a large reservoir of mutual interests. These served both to enhance the prestige of the group and to develop a spirit of interdependence. They nourished and enriched the affections and emotions—basic elements in family life. Through their normal interplay a consensus of emotional attitudes automatically developed in which each individual member more or less harmoniously related his life to that of every other member and in turn to the group as a whole. Sympathy and respect as well as affection toward each other, and loyalty, pride, and responsibility toward the group, naturally resulted. All this lent generous and salutary aid to the task of building vital families and of creating wholesome home life. It made for familial unity, for group solidarity. The medieval family was blest indeed with a large and homogeneous mutuality of cultural interests. It suffered no disintegration or decay by being stripped of its adhesive bonds or by being robbed of its cohesive functions.

MENTAL FAMILY BONDS

The Family Complex.—Quite a different type of bond from all the above-mentioned is what might be called the mental family bond. The family group is not only bound by cultural and emotional bonds but also by mental or intellectual ties. The home is at least as much a matter of mind as it is a matter of heart. In the final analysis it is really an organization of attitudes that might be called the family complex. ‘‘These attitudes tend to assume the form of intimate identification and consensus between members of the family, with a feeling of common purpose and of common interests, i. e. family consciousness.''[8]

Where there is likeness of attitudes among the members of a group they exert a powerfully integrating influence upon the entire group. Identity of attitudes involves identity of objectives, of ambitions, and of ideals. All these contribute a generous share towards that unique and indissoluble whole, the family complex. A likeness of attitudes impels toward identification of behavior on the part of the family members, rather than toward individualization of conduct; for our actions are greatly influenced by the acquired contents of our minds. As a rule, similarity of attitudes results in similarity of behavior. Normally, those who think alike, act alike.

In the medieval Christian family the general attitudes of practically all with regard to family life were strikingly similar; in matters fundamental, in fact, they were identical. In minor matters there was undoubtedly disagreement, leading at times to tensions in the family circle. But commonly these tensions were not permitted to grow and to take on proportions. The theology of the Catholic Church permeated the masses. The integral philosophy of Christianity held full sway throughout Europe. Religious interests were supreme. Moreover, the very culture of the time also made for similarity. In family life Christian ideals and principles were dominant. Not only were they the same for all, but they were also definite and fixed. These common objectives and satisfying ideals gave a determined direction to the will of the individual and a community of similar mental attitudes to the group. They naturally assured an integrating family complex. Thus, mental or intellectual solidarity was added to the cultural unity and to emotional harmony of the medieval family. Sympathetic radiation, rising out of harmonious sentiments and affections; social suggestion, growing out of similarity of mental content; and imitation of behavior, resulting from both these former, united to integrate the little domestic world. It is not surprising that history pictures the home of the Middle Ages as a closely integrated unit.

---

[8] Mowrer, E. R., *Family Disorganization,* p. 140.

But the Church helped the family not only by suggesting for it a philosophy of family life. In many other ways it gave the home support and aid. Some of these other methods and means will receive attention in following chapters.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. Mention other family bonds besides those treated in this chapter.
2. Which bond do you think the most influential in integrating the family?
3. Give further examples of patriarchal families.
4. What is a matriarchal family?
5. What type of family seems most common among primitive people?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bosanquet, H., *The Family.*
Duprat, G. L., *Le Lien Familial* (Paris, 1924).
Ellwood, C. A., *Sociology and Social Problems,* Ch. VII.
Ogburn, W. F., "Our Social Heritage," *Survey Graphic,* Dec., 1927.
Schmiedeler, E., *The Industrial Revolution and the Home.*

CHAPTER II

THE CHURCH AND THE FAMILY

The Church and the Greco-Roman Pagan Family.—Christianity from its very infancy stressed the importance of family life, and that with no small measure of success. It not only restored those essentials of marriage that paganism had cast aside but also raised the whole of family life to higher levels. Ellwood [1] has briefly indicated its early influence upon the home. "Early Christianity . . . found the family life of the Greco-Roman world demoralized. The reconstruction of the family became, therefore, one of the first tasks of the new religion, and while other circumstances may have aided the Church in this work still, on the whole it was mainly the influence of the early Church that reconstructed the family life. From the first the Church worked to abolish divorce, and fought as evil such vices as concubinage and prostitution, that came to flourish to such an extent in the Pagan world. Only very slowly did the early leaders of the Church win the mass of people to accepting their views as to the permanency of the marriage bond. In order to aid in making this bond more stable the early Church recognized marriage as one of the sacraments, and, as implied, steadily opposed the idea of the later Roman law that marriage was simply a private contract. The result was, eventually, that marriage came to be regarded again as a religious bond, and the family life took on once more the aspect of great stability. After the Church had come fully into power in the Western world, legal divorce ceased to be recognized and legal separation substituted in its stead. Thus the Church succeeded in reconstituting the family life upon a stable basis, but the family after being reconstituted, was of semi-patriarchal type. Nothing was more natural than this, for the church had no model to go by except the paternal family of the Hebrew and Greek and Roman civilization. Nevertheless, the place women and children held in this semi-patriarchal religious family established by the Church was higher on the whole than in the ancient patriarchal family. The church put an end to the exposure of children, which had been common in Rome, and protected childhood in many ways. It also exalted the place of woman in the family, though leaving her subject to her husband. The veneration of the Virgin tended particularly to give women an honored place socially and religiously. . . . On the whole the reconstituting of the family by the church must be regarded as its most striking social work."

---

[1] Ellwood, C. A., *Sociology and Modern Social Problems*, pp. 132–134.

The above lines briefly sketch a fair picture of the Church's work in reconstituting on a Christian basis the disintegrated pagan family of the Greco-Roman world. To show in detail how that wonderful task was accomplished would be a gigantic undertaking indeed, and it would take us altogether too far afield. Naturally the entire system of the Church was involved in this truly remarkable accomplishment—its doctrines of faith and morals, its ideals and practices, its legislation and the very civilization that it engendered. Some of the chief factors will be given attention here. Others, again, may more profitably be treated in later chapters.

THE ESSENTIALS OF MARRIAGE

Fundamental, above all, was the Church's doctrine regarding marriage. She uncompromisingly upheld the three essential foundation stones of marriage without which the superstructure of family life cannot endure, namely unity, indissolubility, and sanctity. For lack of these, the renowned nations of antiquity have disappeared. The pagan nations around her, which were without them, were sick at heart and were rapidly disintegrating. Concerning these fundamentals the Church could not compromise. She insistently taught and constantly insisted upon them until all held the same view on the matter. Even the common mental attitude alone that resulted exerted a tremendous influence in integrating home-life.

The Sanctity of Marriage; Celibacy.—In earlier days as in later times the Church always maintained that marriage is indeed the most natural of institutions inasmuch as it is the basis of human society; but it also held this union to be one of the most divine agencies, for God had especially intervened to give it form and law. In seeking, therefore, to renew domestic life, Christianity most naturally made use of all the good features of the family idea scattered throughout the world. It built upon the natural, upon all the good that came from the light of reason, from the traditions of the past and from the voice of conscience. It restored marriage to its primitive sanctity. But, over and above this, it added also something new: it lifted the married life of Christians to a supernatural level, clothing it with the dignity of a sacrament. In the eyes of the Church parenthood was naturally considered sacred, because parents are the representatives of God in the training of His earthly children; sacred, too, because of the sacrifices and unselfishness that it entails. But by raising marriage to the dignity of a sacrament, home-life was made holier still. Thereby, under the Christian dispensation, marriage became one of the great channels through which the human race was to draw upon the graces of the Redemption. Man and wife were to have special graces to enable them to discharge faithfully the serious obligations and responsibilities of the married state. An already holy vocation was, as it were, supersanctified by being elevated to the dignity of a sacrament. St. Paul indicates the supernatural character of marriage when he compares it to the union of Christ with His Church: ‘‘Husbands, love your wives as Christ loved His Church and delivered Himself for it that He might sanctify and cleanse it'' (Eph. V, 25–26). Thus did Christ stamp marriage with the supernatural by modeling it upon His own mystical union with His Church and by making it a mystery of religion and a channel of supernatural grace.

Yet, in almost seeming contradiction, Christianity placed celibacy on the supernatural plane and ranked it even higher than marriage. Without a proper conception of the Church's stand on celibacy, Christian marriage cannot well be understood; whereas with a proper understanding of her view regarding celibacy, her conception of the sacredness of marriage is seen only to be reënforced. From the earliest times voluntary virginity was a distinctly Christian ideal and the Church ever considered such deliberate choice of a single state, from a supernatural motive, as spiritually very fruitful. A life of perpetual virginity dedicated to God is held to be a better life than one of marriage. This is not because marriage is bad, or that it is merely a concession to human frailty; but because that which is lower in our nature is thereby more completely conquered by the higher; because this ideal makes possible the unhindered fulfilment of the heroic works of Christian charity; and finally because there can be, among the unmarried, closer union with God, since their hearts are less divided and their oblation more complete. The last consideration is of the utmost importance since man has been created for a supernatural end and is destined to be transformed into the likeness of God. Furthermore, celibacy is valuable in representing the independence of the higher aims in life as opposed to the ascendency of the family impulses and aims; thus safeguarding marriage and keeping it from being degraded from the dignity of a sacrament to a mere matter of gratification. It is valuable also to those who, from some natural causes, cannot marry. It happily enables them to look upon their state as a hallowed one, not as one of necessity and of frustrated existence.

Unity and Indissolubility.—Christianity not only insisted upon the sanctity of the married state but also restored and stressed anew the essential characteristics of unity and indissolubility. In addition to the ancient unity and perpetuity which were renewed by absolute prohibition of polygamy and by making absolutely indissoluble every marriage finally consummated among Christians, a new and mysterious bond between husband and wife was created. Their union was made an image of the union of Christ and his Church; and the love between the heavenly Bridegroom and his Spouse was to be the pattern of the love between the partners in a Christian marriage. There was to be a union of thought and sentiment most ideal and at the same time most intimate and complete. Both in theory and in practice the Church has always used her influence in the upholding of this stand. It went far in reconstituting the broken family life she found at the time of her institution by Christ.

Recalling these characteristics of marriage as found in the old and the new dispensation, Pope Leo XIII writes:[2] "This union of man and woman, that it might answer more fittingly to the infinitely wise counsels of God, even from that beginning manifested chiefly two most excellent properties—deeply sealed, as it were, and signed upon it—namely, unity and perpetuity. From the gospel we see clearly that this doctrine was declared and openly confirmed by the divine authority of Jesus Christ. He gave witness to the Jews and to His apostles that marriage, from its very institution, should exist between two only, that is, between one man and one woman; that of two they are made, so to say, one flesh; and that the marriage bond is by the will of God so closely and strongly made fast that no man can dissolve it or rend it asunder. 'For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be in one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let no man put asunder!'" Under the Christian law, then, there were to be no more bills of divorce. Both simultaneous and successive polygamy were excluded. Such perversions as polygyny, polyandry, group marriage, and promiscuity were banned, and indissoluble monogamy alone was to remain. And eventually, through the efforts of the Church, this teaching won recognition throughout Europe. Reprobating divorce for her children from the very beginning, the Church had by the twelfth century brought the civil law into conformity with her own canon law on this point. Divorce was prohibited for any cause whatever. At most a separation for certain grave reasons was permitted. Medieval Europe presented a spectacle of unparalleled family unity and solidarity. In view of the disintegrated condition of family life at the beginning of the Christian era, this was a truly remarkable accomplishment.

---

[2] *Pope and People*, pp. 43–44 (Catholic Truth Society, London).

Lecky [3] rightly observes that this sweeping prohibition of divorce "was not originally imposed in Christian nations upon utilitarian grounds, but was based upon the belief that marriage is the special symbol of the perpetual union of Christ and His Church." Certainly no merely utilitarian motive could have had the tremendous effect in restricting divorce that was accomplished by the Church's teaching on marriage and the family, inculcated with inspiring earnestness and supported by the plenary power of an integrated Christianity.

RELATIONS BETWEEN FAMILY MEMBERS

The Church did not rest satisfied with merely inculcating her doctrines regarding the three essential characteristics of marriage, namely, sanctity, unity, and indissolubility. It was not enough that the foundation of the home be secure, the superstructure also must be well-planned and substantially constructed. Hence, in every possible way the Church always brought her influence to bear in the promotion of a truly satisfying and harmonious family life. One of the chief methods made use of was guidance and direction, that is, teaching the proper relations of the individual members of the family group towards each other. The careful observance of her teaching in this sphere has done very much to balance these relations and to build up a harmonious and integrated family life. Particularly did these doctrines of the Church do much toward curbing the paternal power that had been so readily abused by the pagan patriarch. By their constant inculcation the Church continually sought to place the whole family relationship upon an ideal basis of love and loyalty rather than upon coercion and force. A more wholesome position for the wife and child in the home gradually resulted.

---

[3] Lecky, *History of European Morals*, Vol. II, p. 355.

Husband and Wife.—In their essentials, the Christian relations between husband and wife were defined and set forth by the Church in no unmistakable terms. The respective positions of the two in the Christian family had been indicated by St. Paul in his epistle to the Ephesians (V, 22–33). "Let women be subject to their husbands, as to the Lord; because the husband is head of the wife, as Christ is head of the Church . . . Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered Himself up for it . . . He that loveth his wife, loveth himself. For no man ever hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, as also Christ does the Church. . . . This is a great sacrament; but I speak in Christ and in the Church."

In these words St. Paul sets forth the sacramental nature and deep mystery of Christian marriage—a new type of union that was to place men and women on a moral and spiritual level of equality and bind both equally by their obligations. It is also to this passage of St. Paul that Pope Leo XIII refers in his encyclical on *Christian Marriage*,[4] when he speaks of the mutual rights and duties of husbands and wives. "They are bound," he says, "to have such feelings for one another as to cherish always very great mutual love, to be ever faithful to their marriage vow, and to give one another an unfailing and unselfish help. The husband is the chief of the family, and the head of the wife. The woman, because she is flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone, must be subject to her husband and obey him; not, indeed, as a servant, but as a companion, so that her obedience shall be wanting neither in honor nor dignity. Since the husband represents Christ, and since the wife represents the Church, let there always be, both in him who commands and in her who obeys, a heaven-born love guiding both in their respective duties. For the husband is head of the wife; as Christ is head of the Church.'' The words are unmistakable. The husband was to be the head of the domestic society, but that headship was to be like that of Christ over His Church, the obedience like that of the Church to Christ. The relation was to be one of honor and not of servility. There was given no power or privilege of abuse. Such was ever the interpretation of the Church.

---

[4] *Pope and People*, pp. 47–48.

Certainly no higher compliment could have been paid to marriage than that given it by St. Paul when he compared the union of husband and wife to the union of Christ and His Church. The love of husband and wife should be as tender as was Christ's love for His Church. But Christ loved His Church with a true and self-sacrificing love; He even died for the Church He had established. The love binding together husband and wife must be such a love. The basis upon which the sacramental structure of Christian marriage was to stand was not to be mere passion and impulse, but an affection that was to be true at once to God and to man's higher nature. Only where there is such love is the Christian ideal of marriage realized.

Again, while the husband was to be head of the home, there was to be no servility, no inferiority. Woman was to be subject to the husband as to the Lord, because the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is head of the Church. A higher ideal could not be placed before husband and wife to strive after. The decree, ''he shall rule over thee,'' was not to be perverted as in some pagan lands, by making woman a slave. Rather was the injunction, ''husbands, love your wives,'' to cause to blossom forth in the heart of man that love of woman which would make her a companion, that tenderness which would lead him ever to shield her, that chivalry which would make him sacrifice for her safety and good, and that admiration and respect which would make him ever turn to her for his lessons in culture and refinement.

Influence upon Womankind.—Woman was to no small extent the gainer by the Church's inculcation and interpretation of these principles regarding the relations of husbands and wives toward each other. "The testimony of history," writes Rössler,[5] "as to the position of woman in all pre-Christian and non-Christian peoples may be summed up as follows: No people has completely misjudged the natural position of woman, so that everywhere woman appears in greater or lesser subordination to man. No people, however, has done full justice to the personal dignity of woman; on the contrary, most people evidence an alarmingly low moral level by their degrading oppression of woman. . . . The history of the pre-Christian era mentions no far-reaching and successful revolt of women to obtain improvement of their position. Custom finally became an established habit, and found its strongest defenders among the women themselves. It was the teaching of Christ which first brought freedom to the female sex, wherever this teaching was seriously taken as a guide of life."

Various other doctrines of Christianity besides those of the relations of husband and wife, it is true, played a part in improving woman's condition, and in begetting such highly educated and strong types of independent womanhood as St. Catherine of Sienna, the leader of pontiffs and people, as Hildegarde, Teresa of Jesus, and a host of others, who wielded such great influence within the domain of the Church. Such doctrines, for instance, were the sanctity, unity, and indissolubility of marriage, woman's right to choose a life of either celibacy or marriage, and the teaching that there was but one moral standard for all. St. Jerome[6] but stated the common doctrine of the universal Church when he wrote in the early years of Christianity: "Among us . . . what is not permitted to women is also forbidden to men." One and the same moral law, therefore, bound both husband and wife. There was to be no compromise with vice, no middle state between marriage and chastity. Violation of any moral law made man and woman equally guilty.

---

[5] *Catholic Encyclopedia*, pp. 689–690, Vol. XV.
[6] *Epis.* 77, *ad Oceanum*," P. L. XXII, 691.

Furthermore, the two were to be on the same plane of spiritual equality. From the beginning of its history the Church clearly recognized the spiritual equality of men and women. Both had been redeemed by the Savior of the world and their souls were alike precious in the sight of God. Thus Clement of Alexandria[7] in his work on the daily conduct of the devout Christian writes: "The virtue of man and woman is the same. And those whose life is common have common graces and a common training." Moreover, the most perfect personal equality is expressed in the Apostolic exhortation, "For as many of you as have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ. . . . There is neither male nor female. For ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. III, 27–28).

The Church, however, not only recognized the spiritual equality of man and woman, but also their physical inequality. Man and woman were looked upon as complements of each other, the one supplying what the other lacked. They were considered mutually dependent and helpful, not as mutually antagonistic and hostile. Together they were to form a perfect whole.

By living up to the Christian conception of their relations toward one another, husband and wife did not become a handicap to each other but the greatest source of contentment, peace, and happiness. By the cultivation of such attitudes as the Church inculcated, differences of wish and of view that threatened to crop out at times, were not settled on the basis of law but on that of love. Affection, ever ready to lead to concession and compromise, was the customary arbiter.

---

[7] "The Instructor," *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. II, p. 211.

It is not surprising, then, that as a matter of fact, with the growth of Christianity and the spread of her doctrines, there was a corresponding decline in the *patria potestas* of the Roman father and a betterment of woman's position. ''With the Christian emperors,'' says Muirhead,[8] ''the last traces disappeared of the *familia* as an aggregate of persons and estate subject absolutely to the power and dominion of its head.'' The system which replaced that of the past might well be termed, as Ellwood puts it, ''semipatriarchal.'' The husband and father was still head of the home so that family solidarity was assured, but his autocratic control over wife and child had disappeared. His dominion was circumscribed by inflexible laws. His power was restrained by affectional and religious unison, constrained not by force but by love.

Goodsell also indicates this fact in the case of the Anglo-Saxon women of the Middle Ages, declaring that the Church exercised its influence to improve the condition of married women and girls, and to mitigate the too harsh influence of authority by the husband and father. Furthermore, the Church rendered a service to civilization by stamping out the last vestiges of polygamy among the Anglo-Saxon peoples, and accomplished, by its influence, a gradual softening of manners and the elevation of woman's position in the home. Already in the earlier centuries of the medieval period, the status of Anglo-Saxon women had greatly improved.[9]

So too was the education of the women of the time due to the influence of the Church. Thus, Thrupp,[10] also referring to Anglo-Saxon women, declares: ''The high education bestowed on women during the last era of Anglo-Saxon civilization, and the independent position they attained, tended to place them on an equality with the male sex; and combined with the chastity and sobriety which generally distinguished them, offered a sound foundation for the chivalrous respect and devotion of later times."

---

[8] Muirhead, *Historical Introduction to the Private Law of Rome*, p. 390.

[9] Goodsell, W., *The Family as a Social and Educational Institution*, p. 198.

[10] Thrupp, *The Anglo-Saxon Home*, p. 74

It would, of course, be too much to expect that the ideal relation upheld and promoted by the Church was fully reached and constantly maintained by all her members. In fact, it must be acknowledged that human passions have frequently prevented the bringing about of a condition fully corresponding with the ideals. Yet beyond all doubt the Church has had no small share in fostering the contented and happy home life of the Christian past. Where her doctrines were observed they integrated the family and made the domestic microcosm a fitting place for the chief function of the home, the training of the children. Such homes, undoubtedly, were frequently quite equalitarian or democratic in character, the husband's headship being very little in actual evidence within the family circle itself.

Parent and Child.—The relations of parents and children, although not so liable to be distorted by passion, also needed to be restored and raised to higher levels by Christianity. While recognizing the need for paternal authority the Church sought always to protect the child against both an excess and a deficiency of this authority. In the earliest days of her existence she had particularly to bend her efforts towards checking such abusive authority as that exercised by the Roman patriarchs. She could not approve of such over-severity toward children that caused much unnecessary child-suffering and at times even robbed them of fundamental rights. Here, too, the Church sought to reconstitute the whole relationship upon a foundation of love and loyalty. Perhaps more forceful compulsion was needed at times, but as a rule it could well be closeted and out of sight. It is needless to add that wherever the Church made her influence felt she consistently sought to safeguard for the child such fundamental rights as the right to life, freedom of consent with regard to marriage, proper physical care and preparation for the making of its own way in later life.

The Christian doctrine, inculcated by the Church, also maintained that children, on their part, owe their parents honor, affection, and obedience. The duties of honor and affection, children were taught, must never fail. These reach even beyond the grave. The duty of obedience, however, was to be less absolute and lasting. Since the chief reason for this virtue was the training of the children and the order of the household, it was naturally to come to an end when the child had grown up and quitted the parental home. By these doctrines, then, the parental office was glorified and the dignity of the child respected. The child was thus kept free from absolute dependence upon the parent and, on the other hand, was protected against parental abuse.

Essential and Accidental Duties.—There are certain parental duties that spring from the relation of parent and child and which are the same in all climes and under all circumstances. The highest duties of parents center in the spiritual welfare of the child; in giving it the proper example, in teaching it the truths of religion, and in shielding it from evil influence. Again, parents are bound to provide for the life and health of their offspring until these can provide for themselves; and even then, if the children fall into want, the parents must help and support them. The Christian law also demands that the parents give their children the means, or the technical training, necessary to gain an honest living and to become established in honest marriage. No civil law could absolve parents from such essential obligations. They are under no obligations, however, to heap up riches for their children.

Such are some of the more essential Christian principles concerning the relations of parents and children. Their constant inculcation by the Church down through the centuries has constantly done much to promote family solidarity and to insure the reasonable fulfilment of the prime purposes of the home. They leave many things that may be still more exactly settled, for instance, by the civil power, and allow a wide margin for different laws and customs. An example of such a more accidental matter is the age at which children reach their majority or can hold private property. Laws there may be, too, that diverge noticeably from the Christian ideal. There have been such in the past at times; civil laws that sought to rob the parents of their rights over the education of their children, or that gave the father full power to disinherit his children and leave them in want. Common, too, have been laws by means of which the State upheld an usurpation of power on the part of parents that left the children without free consent to enter the marriage contract. Such laws were far from the Christian ideal and could only harm the home.

Pope Leo XIII[11] also briefly touched upon the relations of parents and children in his encyclical before quoted. "As regards children, they ought to submit to the parents and obey them, and give them honor for conscience' sake; while, on the other hand, parents are bound to give all care and watchful thought to the education of their offspring and their virtuous bringing-up: 'Fathers . . . bring them up in the discipline and correction of the Lord' (Eph. vi, 4). From this we see clearly that the duties of husbands and wives are neither few nor light; although to married people who are good these burdens become not only bearable but agreeable, owing to the strength which they gain through the sacrament." Thus did an official spokesman of the Church in modern times express anew to the Christian world the attitude that did so much to build wholesome home life upon the ruins of the pagan domestic world.

Fraternal Relations.—Brothers and sisters also stand in a special relationship toward each other. The Church has always taught that they are bound by the Christian law to love and help one another. And they are bound not only by the common tie of Christian charity but also by the virtue of dutifulness which they are obliged to practise toward each other. Thus the older children are expected to help in the education of the younger ones or to help those who have fallen into distress. One child cannot simply take his portion and wash his hands of the rest, as if he were bound to brother and sister only in the same manner as to anyone outside the family. The Church, by constantly insisting upon these principles of fraternal relations, did much toward the realization of the prime purposes of family life.

---

[11] *Pope and People*, p. 48.

Matters of Obligation.—The various doctrines regarding the interrelations of family members are not altogether easy of fulfilment. Yet, they are in full accord with reason and common-sense. Moreover, they are socially most useful and of particular benefit to home life. They demand that the individual, at times, sacrifice himself for the good of the group. But without that spirit of altruism neither the family nor any other social group can endure. Where these doctrines are observed, however, family harmony naturally results and the members are amply rewarded for their ordinary sacrifices by the enjoyment of the true values of life, the deep joys of happy home-life. Hence, the Church has done more than to place as ideals before the people these doctrines regarding the relations of family members. She has always inculcated them as very real duties and has ever brought all her compulsion of love and of fear to bear upon their faithful observance. And she has taken ever the same attitude with regard to the whole training of the child in the home. This has done much indeed toward fulfilment of the prime purposes of marriage and of the family. Naturally, the parents who take seriously the thought that they are accountable before God for the spiritual and temporal welfare of their children, give serious consideration to the fulfilment of their duties toward them. They readily see in a cordial and harmonious relation between themselves, and in a stable and closely integrated family life, the best guarantee of the execution of their obligations. Imbued with such thoughts, parents view marriage and the family, not primarily as a means of working out their own hapipness, but as a serious project, the chief purpose of which is the proper rearing of children. As a result the idea of marriage and the family as a race service, and as a service of God, supplants more selfish viewpoints. The obligations of children, too—their duties of filial love and obedience—become a powerful force helping toward their wholesome training and toward uniting parent and child into a harmonious and socially healthy, domestic world. Such a situation makes for group unity and solidarity, for familial harmony and integrity. It insures the reasonable fulfilment of the purposes of the family.

The Church, in constantly insisting upon the observance of the Christian doctrine regarding the inter-relations of family members, has rendered a tremendously important social service to the race. No less has she done so in upholding the three fundamental elements of marriage, its unity, indissolubility, and sanctity, thereby assuring a permanent foundation upon which the beautiful superstructure of Christian home life might be confidently reared. In many other ways, too, the Church helped the home in the past. Attention will be directed toward some of these in the following chapter.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

See end of Chapter III continued.

CHAPTER III

The Church and the Family (Continued)

Since there is no other institution upon which the welfare of the human race so intimately depends, it is not surprising that the Church has ever shown the deepest interest in family life. Nor has she been only passively interested. She has actively shown her concern for family life in many different ways. By all possible means in the days of pagan Rome she exerted her power and influence to reconstitute the disintegrated domestic domains of Roman times. To this day she has eagerly sought to keep home-life in a flourishing condition. In the foregoing chapter we noted two different ways in which the Church supported family life; namely, by insistence upon the three indispensable foundation stones of marriage—unity, sanctity, and indissolubility—and by laying down definite principles that should serve as guides for the group members in their relations with one another. These efforts, however, by no means indicate the full extent of the Church's influence over marriage and the family. Indirectly, for instance, many of her doctrines of faith and morals have served to bolster up the home. Among the means of control that the Church made use of from the earliest times to promote an integrated family life, was her marriage legislation. By this legislation she sought to erect around marriage adequate defenses and to hedge in the home with all possible safeguards.

LEGAL SAFEGUARDS OF MARRIAGE [1]

Because of the sacramental character of the marriage contract the Church could not remain indifferent to anything that concerned matrimony, nor approve its celebration without intervention on her part. Respect for the sacrament, as well as regard for the interests of the individual, the family, and society, demanded that great care be taken to secure both the validity and the liceity of the contract. In her legislation the Church kept these aims in view. Recognizing the fact that all men have by nature a right to marry, her legislation facilitated as much as possible the exercise of that right. But, mindful also of the fact that marriage is a social and race function, the Church did not hesitate to exercise control over it for the good of society. Her attitude in the past was always, as it is still to-day, that marriage was established primarily for the good of the race and only secondarily for the welfare of the individual. Hence, in her legislation she has ever sought to balance the rights of both individual and society. While too much could not be expected from law alone, it had its honored and useful place. Here attention will be given briefly to some of the earlier marriage laws of the Church that were particularly helpful in replacing, by the Christian ideal, the family life of the pagan and the barbarian European.

---

[1] Ayrinhac, H. A., *Marriage Legislation in the New Code of Canon Law:* Bachofen, O. S. B., Chas. A., *A Commentary on Canon Law,* Vol. V.

Investigation and the Publication of the Banns.—From earliest Christian times the Church made provision for the investigation of proposed marriages before the rite was performed. During the first centuries of her existence, the question of an approaching marriage was referred to the bishop, who would see that there were no obstacles or legitimate objections to the union. Such a measure was preventive and naturally safeguarded the family. When the faithful became more numerous and parishes were established, the duty of watching over marriages devolved upon the parish clergy. They were first directed to make a careful investigation in each case and later on, when this proved insufficient, they were commanded to publish in church the marriages about to be celebrated. The investigation was made in order to protect the consent of the persons concerned in the marital contract, to discover possible impediments to the union, and to give religious instruction if needed.

When the examination of the parties by the pastor, together with the assistance afforded him by relatives and neighbors, proved insufficient, the Fathers of the Fourth Council of the Lateran decided that some additional measure was necessary. For some time previously it had been the custom, and the law in some places, to publish in the church the names of persons intending to marry, so that those who knew of any impediment to their unions might reveal them, and those who had any reason for opposing the marriage would have opportunity for doing so. The Council of the Lateran made such publication of the banns of matrimony a universal law of the Church in 1215. The Council of Trent renewed the law. The purposes of the investigation and publication remained the same throughout. The regulation proved very beneficial in safeguarding marriage and protecting home-life by preventing hasty and ill-advised marriages.

Freedom of Consent.—Another matter that the Church zealously sought to protect by her marriage laws was the freedom of consent on the part of the contracting parties. This protection was but to be expected since marriage carried with it such serious responsibilities and far-reaching consequences. Moreover, since the decision was to be final there was every reason that it should be made altogether freely. One of the main purposes of the investigation and publication of the banns spoken of, was to ensure the utmost liberty in the choice of married life. But by even more direct legislation did the Church seek to safeguard freedom of consent in marriage. She took the attitude that marriage without such freedom was null and void. By this legislation she defended the liberty of subjects against the abuses of the civil authority as manifested in the pretenses of princes, and she likewise upheld the liberty of children against the misuse of parental authority. Insisting that freedom of consent is of the essence of the contract and the first condition for the validity of the sacrament, the Church staunchly maintained in the early years of Christianity as she does to-day that consent in marriage must come freely from the individual and cannot be supplied by any human power, paternal, ecclesiastical, or civil. Such protection given the individual when entering upon marriage, helped to make lighter the unswerving observance of the fundamental essentials of Christian marriage, namely, unity, indissolubility, and sanctity.

Most intimately related to this subject were the Church's laws regarding abduction. These laws date far back into the centuries. Already during the centuries of violence and disorder following the fall of the Roman Empire the Church found it necessary to take special measures for the protection of woman and for the liberty of the marriage contract. As early, therefore, as the sixth century we find stringent legislation against abduction passed by some Particular Councils of the Church. By the ninth century such violent seizure and detention had become clearly an impediment to marriage. From time to time some minor variations were made in the law to suit the special circumstances of the time.

The Impediment of Consanguinity.—The Church always sought to accommodate her laws to the changing circumstances of time and place. Preceding the thirteenth century, for instance, custom and popular practice had extended the impediment of consanguinity to the seventh degree in the collateral line of relationship. This was spoken of as the common law in the twelfth century. Probably the impediment was not a diriment or nullifying one to the remotest degree, but even so it extended too far. Consequently the Lateran Council in 1215 limited it to the fourth degree.

This particular impediment of consanguinity was beneficial to family life in a number of different ways. First of all, it was a safeguard to morality within the home and within the kinship group. The great amount of promiscuous intermingling would give rise to critical dangers to morality. Such legislation excluded all idea of love-making and marriage and thus these menaces to morality were in a very great measure lessened. The Church's ruling was, moreover, influenced by the fact that the love which leads to mating, and the kind of affection which binds the members of a family together are two different bonds which should not be merged. Psychological and psychiatric studies are bearing out in many ways to-day the soundness of the Church's stand on near-kin marriage down through the centuries. Fixation, for instance, or the too great attachment between members of the same family, originating in youth, imposes a handicap on the personality of the individuals concerned, even preventing them from breaking the emotional bond and from taking their normal place in the outside world.

Such seems to be the chief ground that gave rise to the Church's prohibition of near-kin marriages. Another reason that was particularly of importance in the small permanent group of the past was the fact that the prohibition of such marriages tended to break down family clannishness, and by multiplying between different groups bonds of friendship through intermarriage, united these groups themselves all the more in peace and harmony.

There were eugenic reasons of consequence, too, that made it desirable for the individual to look outside his group for a mate. This arrangement provided opportunity for bringing new traits into the family stock as well as for denying expression to undesirable qualities that might be latent within the stock. Present-day knowledge of genetics, however, shows no foundation for the common belief that near-kin marriage is apt to result in weak or degenerate offspring, irrespective of the family stock of the two mates. On the contrary, the facts we possess appear to show that if the ancestry of the two is good, the children have a double chance of being benefitted by marriage within the stock. On the other hand, if the stock has an undesirable strain in it, there is every danger that the children will be doubly handicapped. If, however, an individual from a defective stock marries into another family, the recessive or concealed traits in him will be more liable to remain latent than if he married within the family stock itself. Thus, eugenically as well as morally and socially, the Church's laws concerning consanguineous marriages promote wholesome family life and thereby, in turn, benefit the human race.

Mixed Marriages.—Another regulation of the Church with regard to marriage that was of great social value, was her condemnation of so-called mixed marriages (between Christians and pagans). Even from the days of St. Paul and St. John the Church forbade such unions. During the Middle Ages, however, this question was scarcely raised, since there were few outside the Church. In the earlier days, though, it was necessary, and it served to protect the faith of the members of the infant Church by excluding constant and intimate contact between pagan and Christian within the confines of the domestic microcosm. But this prohibition also protected their family life by precluding the inevitable internal disturbances to which such unions would give rise. Religion deals with the most fundamental attitudes of life, and consequently one cannot but expect differences in this field readily to become disruptive forces in the home-world. The fact that, particularly in the field of religion, similarity of views and of attitudes between mates makes for harmonious family life, while dissimilarity easily leads to disharmony and disagreement, will be given further attention elsewhere. There is no room for doubt that the Church's laws regarding mixed marriages safeguarded both religion and the home.

Publicity and Ceremonial Rite.—It is manifestly important for many reasons of private well-being and public policy that the question of actual marriage between two individuals be verifiable beyond all doubt. To this end it is necessary that marriages be properly witnessed and that they become matters of official public record. In her marriage service the Church has favored not only publicity but even religious ceremonial pomp. It is certain that from earliest times, Christians clothed the marriage union with a certain ceremony that differed from that prescribed by the Roman law, though they undoubtedly observed also the prevailing civil law of marriage. St. Ignatius[2] writes: "It becomes both men and women who marry to be united with the consent of the bishop, that the marriage be according to the Lord and not according to the lust." Again, Tertullian,[3] whose denunciations against clandestine marriages were so violent that one would be led to conclude that in his time they were invalid, exclaims in praise of public marriages: "I could not sufficiently praise that marriage which the Church accepts, the oblation ratifies, the blessing seals." Moreover, regulations forbidding secret marriages were repeatedly made by Particular Councils of the Church, especially from the eighth century on. Then, too, there was the additional law of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 that commanded that prospective marriages be publicly announced. Yet, in spite of all laws, there were abuses. The Church in the past had to contend with the secret or clandestine marriage much as the state has to contend with the common law marriage to-day. Some continued to contract marriages secretly, with the result that legitimately married persons could separate and enter another contract which, although null, was to be held valid by the Church. Others lived in concubinage, under cover of supposed occult marriages. Since other prohibitions of the Church had failed to remedy the situation a more drastic ruling was resorted to by the Council of Trent. Clandestine marriages were thenceforth to be considered not only illicit but invalid as well. This stand of the Church, supported by her regulations demanding that all marriages be contracted publicly in the presence of a pastor and at least two additional witnesses, practically abolished occult marriages from the Christian society of the time.

Such are some of the laws by which the Church safeguarded marriage and thereby, in turn, promoted the welfare of the home down through the centuries. By erecting her legal defenses around marriage, and by clothing it with religious ceremonial, she not only insured its validity but also promoted its permanency and advanced the happiness of home-life. Her laws prevented the formation of hasty and unsuitable marriages, and promoted the union of desirable mates. By insisting upon the freedom of consent on the part of both persons entering upon the nuptial contract, the Church could also with good grace demand that the vow be final once the consent was given. In general, her laws did much to uphold the unity, indissolubility, and sanctity of the marriage bond. They made for strong foundations whereon the superstructure of family life might confidently be built. Thus, control of marriage by the Church's canon law became another great means by which she fostered the ideal of Christian family life and upheld the integrity of the home. Because of the fundamental importance of family life, this control in turn was of the greatest social value. In her regulations, the Church had at heart the interest of the parties to the contract, the good of religion, and the promotion of human welfare in general. The integrated family life, the religious spirit, and the whole civilization that arose from the ruins of the paganism and the barbarism that went before, give ample testimony to the success of her efforts.

---

[2] "Ep. ad Polycarp," C. 5. (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, I, p. 95).
[3] "Ad Uxorem," II, 19.

The Marriage Vow.—With all her protective matrimonial legislation, however, marriage itself was not so much a legal contract as a sacred promise. And it was this solemn promise, above all else, that gave the nuptial agreement its stability and welded the medieval family into an integrated unity and an unbreakable solidarity. By means of her ideal of a vow the Church sought to combine at once the fixity that goes with finality, and the self-respect that goes with freedom. It is the only system that history has given us that combines stability with any degree of liberty. Status, or slavery, lacked freedom. Under this system the individual had no freedom of choice either about entering or leaving his state. Contract, on the other hand, lacks stability. The parties to the contract are free both to make and to break the contract. The marriage promise of Christians ever combined both stability and freedom. The sacrament of matrimony was entered into most naturally and voluntarily by the parties concerned. But once the promise was made, there was stability and a satisfying sense of finality. The very thought of dissolution of the bond was once and for all precluded, and thus human conduct was safeguarded from temporary whims and from the caprice of human nature. Marriage became a matter of deepest loyalty, an affair of honor and chivalry, that, in turn, begot a pronounced sense of responsibility and a willingness to meet the difficulties and trials of married life. It was considered noble to bear abnegation if need be, out of a sense of domestic loyalty and for the glory of a solemn promise. It was considered ignoble, both before God and man, to reject the promises made, because of possible discomfort, for instance, or trial involved. This attitude gave a determined direction to the will. It increased the very constancy of the feelings themselves. This solemn promise, "like the presence of a noble companion in whose presence one is compelled to think only one's best thoughts," nipped in the bud any ideas of disloyalty to mate or family that might seek growth in the mind. It included a firm and definite resolution that carried with it the idea of finality. It exerted a purifying and protective influence over the individual's thought and will. It made for stability and fidelity, for a real home-patriotism and loyalty that ennobled the individual while it stabilized and integrated the home.[4]

Thus, besides supporting the home by inculcating her doctrines of matrimony and of the interrelations of family members in the Christian household, as well as by her control of marriage through her legislation, the Church also made a far-reaching contribution toward wholesome and integrated family life by basing marriage upon the ideal foundation of a sacred vow. Many other means, too, did the Church make use of in the construction of that beautiful creation of earth, the Christian family. She ever sought most zealously to give husbands and wives a correct conception of marriage and of family life and thereby forestalled the growth and dominance of false values of life. She endeavored to give individuals both the foresight and self-control necessary for the erection of a harmonious home life upon an impregnable foundation. Those who grasp the integral content of Christianity will readily agree that, where the individual really lives the Christian religion, where religion vitally enters into the home life itself, though there may be failures found at times even among the just, one may well expect to find a confiding and permanent love between husband and wife, a serious effort to train children in the way of righteousness, and a spirit of love and obedience on the part of children. In such a home one may expect to find a domestic circle that is a sanctuary of peace and a nursery of virtue.

---

[4] Chesterton, G. K., *The Superstition of Divorce*, Ch. VI, p. 83.

THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY IN PRACTICE

If things done in common in the family tend to integrate the group, to bind members together, certainly all presumption is in favor of this being the case in the sacred realm of religion. Or, if shared activities in the fields of work and play are excellent means of training children, because of the contagion of example or of the dynamic power of interstimulation, most assuredly will the spiritual and uplifting influence of common religious activities, shared by parent and child, tend in the same direction.

Nor would one expect only such religious practices as are shared in common in the home to cement the relations between parent and child and to make for good family life. The serious practice of the Christian religion by any individual, even outside the home circle, would seem naturally to redound to the benefit of family life and make for unity among family members. The doctrines Christianity teaches, the obligations it insists upon, the ideals it upholds, the moral principles it inculcates—all point to such a conclusion.

It is true the Christian doctrine of the Church on family life does not appeal to the undisciplined or the licentious. While the doctrines undoubtedly have elevated many a family and purified it, both individuals and groups have at times refused to abide thereby and have been cast forth from the Church. From the time of the Corinthian converts of St. Paul down to our own day, there has ever been some divergence between what was taught by the Church and what has been practised by some of her followers. Yet, the Christian ideal of the family is altogether within the realm of possibility, and as a matter of fact is reached by many. To all, the Church's doctrines on marriage and the family ever hold up a high and noble ideal, and history is replete with abundant and consoling examples of many who have lived up faithfully to that ideal. In fact, the same can be said to-day.

Some Examples from History.—We have already noted Ellwood's reference to the reconstructed family of the Middle Ages effected after the domestic world had taken on the aspects of permanence and stability. History is also replete with later examples of exemplary and integrated Christian families.

(1) *France.* M. de Ribbe, in his work on the families of France in the olden times, *Les familles et la société en France avant la Révolution,* has portrayed for us the beautiful inner life of the French homes in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries. The sources of his information are especially unpublished family records known as *libri rationum* or *livres de raison.* First and foremost they indicated a deeply religious spirit among both rich and poor. There was filial piety and parental devotion to duty. There was cultivation of the intellect among women as well as among men. Again, there was a something scarcely known among us to-day;

namely, foundations in villages to enable poor girls to marry. These were very common, in fact, the rule. It is also pointed out that wills were a source of union and not disunion. In a word, there was ordinarily a highly integrated Christian family. Home-life was intimately interwoven with the supernatural. It was highly organized and deeply religious. The purposes of family life were eminently fulfilled.[5]

(2) *Germany.* A similar picture is given us of the German family of the same period by Johannes Janssen, in his *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausang des Mittelalters.* Here especially the influence of the trade guilds on home-life is emphasized. To begin with, immorality was a bar to admission to the guilds. Attention is directed repeatedly to the honorable position and privileges of the wife and widow of the master guildsman. Then, too, there was the fatherly care bestowed upon apprentices. Master and apprentices were bound together by a solemn covenant. The boy or young man became a member of the family, and the master was responsible not merely for his technical training, but for his moral life as well. And the covenant was no empty form. It was habitually fulfilled both in letter and in spirit. Such was the case also in the guilds of France and England. Thus this home-life too was grounded on Christian morals and ideals and its purposes most religiously fulfilled.[6]

(3) *England.* In his *Christian Family Life in Pre-Reformation England,* Cardinal Gasquet, O. S. B., has left a brief but striking picture of English family life of an earlier day. He sets forth in some detail the religious family practices as gathered from the bits of literature of English Pre-Reformation days. There were such practices as morning and evening prayers in common in the home, grace before and after meals, frequently even assistance at the daily mass, the evening blessing asked of their parents by the children, the inculcation of filial reverence and respect, etc., all showing

---

[5] Devas, C. S., *Studies of Family Life,* p. 182.

[6] Ibid., p. 183.

how close, in those days, was the supernatural to the natural—how God was ever present and how the sense of this real, though unseen, presence affected the daily life of all in every Christian home. ''Work,'' he writes, ''was everywhere insisted upon as necessary in God's service, and work was savored, so to speak, by the remembrance of God's presence. The two orders of the natural and the supernatural were not so separated as they are generally supposed to be to-day. Of course there are many in our day who no doubt keep themselves in God's presence, but whilst I believe that most will allow that this is the exception, in the ages of faith it was apparently the rule; and if we may judge from books of instruction and other evidence, God was not far removed from the threshold of most Catholic families in Pre-Reformation days. Of course there were exceptions, and many perhaps led as wicked lives as to-day, but there is obviously something about the family life of that time which is lacking in this. There was the constant recognition of God's sanctifying presence in the family. Of this I have spoken, and over and beside this there were those common religious practices of prayer and self-restraint and mutual encouragement to virtue of which, alas, the modern counterpart of the old English home knows so little. On the faith of those simple and generally unlettered people there was a bloom—I know of no other word to express what I see—which perished as one of the results of the religious revolution of the sixteenth century.''[7]

(4) *Some Nineteenth-Century Families.* Passing on to the nineteenth century we can find among different peoples the same family solidarity and exemplary home-life noted among the Christian groups of earlier days. We need but look through the splendid collection of monographs of Le Play, published under the title, *Les ouvrier européens.* It gives us in great detail descriptions of a large number of families of

---

[7] Gasquet, O. S. B., A. Card., *The Christian Family in Pre-Reformation England*, p. 17.

the working classes from one extremity of Europe to another, as they appeared about the middle of the nineteenth century. Le Play actually lived with three hundred different families in various parts of Europe, making exhaustive studies of their modes of living in order to find a way in which the people might be brought back to peace and stability after the turmoil of Napoleon. Examples are taken from the Hungarian peasant and German smelter-worker; from the Basque fishermen of Spain and the soap-workers of Marseilles, France. In all these typical families there was a noteworthy unity and solidarity, an integrated and beautiful family life in which the influence of religion was strikingly in evidence.[8]

(5) *The Mexican Family.* Coming nearer home, we have the country that lies nearest to us—Mexico. It is a land of many revolutions; hence, if family life is good there, the goodness can scarcely be ascribed in reason to anything but religion. Writing about Mexican family life as seen in the years 1869 and 1870, the American Colonel, A. S. Evans[9] shows how well it fulfilled its primary functions, implying thereby, of course, a family solidarity that alone would make such an ideal situation possible. ''As a rule the influence and control of parents over their children never fully ceases save with death, and after death their memory is cherished, it seems to me, with more fondness than elsewhere in the world. You can see no idle, vicious, saucy boys running around on the streets, annoying decent people by their vile language and rude behavior. All the boys you see have earnest faces, and walk with sedate and grave demeanor like grown-up men. I never saw a badly behaved child in Mexico. In the family circle the people are models for the world. The young always treat the old with deepest respect, and the affection displayed by parents is most admirable. . . . When children marry, they usually remain under the parental roof as long as the parents live, and the parents control the house.''

---

[8] Devas, C. S., *Studies in Family Life*, p. 177.
[9] Evans, A. S., *Our Sister Republic*, Ch. XVI.

(6) *The Colonial American Family.* Writers on the history of the family also agree that religious influence was far from lacking in colonial America. "Families are nurseries of the church and the commonwealth; ruin families and you will ruin all." Such, according to Calhoun,[10] was the maxim adopted by the colonists. Yet, he points out the strangely anomalous situation of the Puritan seeking to strengthen the family and at the same time taking lax views regarding the sacredness of the marriage bond. "Whilst the spirit of Puritanism drew sharp lines around the family and strengthened its stakes, there were Reformation influences . . . that tended to cause the decline of the family as a social unit. Every man was to stand on his own feet." Individualism, as the citation implies, was getting in its disintegrating work.

Many of the colonists braved the dangers of the new world to have the opportunity to practise their religion. This served but to increase their devotion to it. Perhaps, too, the difference in religious beliefs of the time also tended to make each cling all the more earnestly to his faith. Printing had put the Bible within reach of the ordinary home, and its reading was looked upon as a very essential practice in the homes of the time. At any rate, Puritans, Catholics, Quakers, and others who came to the New World, were usually deeply religious individuals. It can hardly be questioned that religion played a far more important role in strengthening and unifying family life than it does in the homes of most of their descendants to-day. Yet, even in many modern American homes one can still find religion a vital, integrating factor.

Thus the doctrines of Christianity regarding marriage and the family were not mere idle theories. They worked out in practice—strikingly so in the case of those who were really imbued with the Christian spirit. Of that, history gives ample testimony. Not only the first construction of the Christian family upon the ruins of paganism, but also the maintenance of that ideal domestic relationship down through the succeeding centuries is to be considered as one of the most important contributions of the Church to society.

---

[10] Calhoun, A. W., *Social History of the American Family*, p. 75.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. Give some further examples of Christian family life of the past.
2. Mention other marriage laws of the Church during the Middle Ages.
3. What other agencies besides the Church helped the medieval family?
4. Distinguish the Christian from the non-Christian family.
5. What are the safeguards of Christian doctrine for the rights and dignity of the wife?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALEXANDER, F. M., *The Catholic Home.*

ARYINHAC, H. A., *Marriage Legislation in the New Code of Canon Law.*

BACHOFEN, O. S. B., C. A., *A Commentary on Canon Law,* Vol. V.

CHESTERTON, G. K., *The Superstition of Divorce,* Ch. VI.

DEVAS, C. S., *Studies in Family Life* (Out of Print).

FLETCHER, M., *The Christian Family,* Chapters I, II, III.

GASQUET, A. Card., "The Christian Family in Pre-Reformation England" (Catholic Truth Society Publication, London).

GERRARD, T. J., *Marriage and Parenthood,* Chapters I, II.

LEO XIII, POPE, *Encyclical on Christian Marriage* (Arcanum Divinae).

MAHONEY, E. J., *Christian Marriage.*

MEYER, O. F. M., F. *Plain Talks on Marriage,* Ch. II.

RYAN, J. A., "The Place of the Family in a Christian Society," *N. C. W. C. Review,* Jan., 1930.

CHAPTER IV

THE FAMILY AND THE SOCIAL ORGANISM

The medieval family and its counterpart of later centuries was bound together by a community of mental, emotional, and cultural interests that found a place within the domestic realm itself. Over and above this union it was supported by the influence of the chief social institution of the time, namely, the Church. Still another force that did very much to stabilize and integrate the home was the social organism in which the familial unit was inherent. This was due both to cultural stability and mental homogeneity. Here, again, the Church played an important role.

The Social Milieu.—Neither the individual nor the family can well be considered units independently of the rest of society. Neither exists in isolation. Both are influenced by the social *milieu* in which they abide. The individual's relationship with his fellowman are very complex. Normally he belongs to a number of social groups that renders him service, that answer his needs. These various groups, in turn, are all interwoven into a large social structure, based upon and circumscribed by the world community of human beings. Many and varied interests serve as threads to bind one group to others. Among the many patches sewn into the crazy-quilt of the social organization are also the family groups. While the patches remain undisturbed and the pattern intact, the social organism presents a harmonious whole. Should some of the groupings suffer change, a considerable rearrangement to suit the change, or even a readaptation to suit the whole, may become necessary to again reestablish harmony.

Or, to vary the figure, where these social interrelations, though complex, remain stable, the complicated machinery of the social organism runs smoothly. We may even remain unaware of the vast network of group relationships in the social system. But let one part of the machinery become disturbed, and the whole machinery will register the change. Unless the cause of the disturbance be corrected, matters may go from bad to worse, until the only remedy is a rearrangement of all the parts, a rebuilding of the entire machine. In a stable environmental situation, on the other hand, the family and all other social life will tend to remain stable likewise.

CULTURAL STABILITY AND FAMILY INTEGRATION [1]

In the centuries preceding the nineteenth, as we have seen, society was relatively stable. Socially and otherwise conditions then remained much the same. There was, for instance, the same wooden plough, the same spindle and loom, of a thousand and more years before. Means of transportation were few and limited. The masses were largely attached to the soil. There was little movement from place to place. The chief means of communication and transportation, too, that we have to-day, were utterly unknown. Hence contact with the great outside world was restricted. Normally, the necessities of life were supplied from the immediate vicinity. The garments were homespun; the food was produced on the home place. Thus, by very force of circumstances, interests and contacts were limited to the domestic world and to a limited and stable environment. Any other condition was rather an exception to a general rule. As a consequence there was little social change; everyday life remained much the same. The agricultural civilization that existed was instrumental not only in supplying the home with many interests that reacted to the good of the domestic microcosm by drawing it together into an integrated whole, but also created a general social stability that in turn had a stabilizing effect upon the family life of the time.

---

[1] Schmiedeler, E., *The Industrial Revolution and the Home.*

The Social Stability of Early Rural America.—Among our own American pioneers we find that the small and stable community group is very much the rule. Even up to the time of the Civil War the great majority of the people were engaged in agricultural pursuits. Community and neighborhood groups were small. The little village was typical of the America of that period. Towns were small, and cities were few. The modern industrial city did not exist. In general, the smaller groups, rather than larger communities, ministered to man's wants and, consequently, enjoyed considerable importance and prestige.

And not only was the average community small; it was also stable. Means of communication and transportation were meagre. The nation was not then linked into one compact whole by a network of railroads. Travel was limited. Rural free delivery of mail and such media of communication as the telephone, wireless, and radio, were still things of the future. Hence, news was scarce. It was customary for people to come to a place, settle down and stay there. Contact with individuals of other neighborhoods or with the great outside world was infrequent. Social intercourse was largely restricted to other members of the individual communities or neighborhood groups. The whole situation made for intimate acquaintance of group members and for stability and fixity. This system prevented much social instability and change.

Social Stability Characteristic of Medieval Europe.—Throughout the Middle Ages, too, there existed an exceptionally stable cultural situation, in consequence of which there was a rather definitely fixed mode of social life and a well established pattern of the family. Agriculture represented the civilization of the masses. Most people lived in small groups and had little to do with outsiders. Feudalism meant fixity. The social structure of Europe was made up of an enormous number of small and practically independent units, such as manors and parishes. To a high degree, various bonds tied the group members together. Whatever activities were necessary for their subsistence, were commonly carried on within the group. Trade relations with other communities were very limited. In fact to no small extent, the only relations with outsiders and members of other communities of influence were those brought about by conditions of hostility. This precluded intimate acquaintanceship and social contact in the proper sense of the term with outside groups. Such mass movements as the Crusades were, of course, exceptions to the rule, and, undoubtedly, had some disturbing effect upon the family and upon the general social life of the times. But the typical situation was that of isolation and fixity, the masses of serfs being attached to the soil. There was even a strong feeling against any deviation from this manner of living. As the gradual breakdown of feudalism set in, laws were enacted attempting to stem the trend towards greater mobility by forcing everyone to belong to some local group and to remain there throughout life. In practice, however, the laws were of little avail after the movement got under way.

Social Habit Predominant.—In these stable groups, as in all more or less static agricultural groups, habit predominated. Day by day and year by year the same individuals reacted upon and were, at the same time, influenced by the same familiar acquaintances. They learned from one another. They copied one another, adopting one another's ways of doing things. The natural result was the formation of local customs, habits and traditions, and routine activity in accordance with them. Thus does social stability always make for sameness and routine, for custom and habit. In agricultural Europe and America community life was carried forward by the massive habits of common life.

Social habit, in turn, makes for coördination and co-adaptation. It is essential to social organization. Without it there is disorganization and disintegration. The group becomes a chaos of social atoms. With it there is coöperation and coordination. And a socially organized community group means a thoroughly integrated domestic world. The family pattern naturally fits into the general frame of the whole social organism of which it is an integral part. Unquestionably there was a close relation between the habituated social life of agricultural communities and the highly organized and integrated family life found therein.

The Effectiveness of Social Pressure.—More particularly, however, the families of these communities of the past were thoroughly organized and integrated because of the influence of community pressure. Such pressure was characteristic of the groups of the time. They were small and stable. Hence, there was intimate acquaintanceship among the group members. Any little happening in the community soon became common knowledge. The individual was constantly under the eyes of the group and consequently had to be careful of his every action. Any noticeable divergence from the common *mores* was certain to meet with indignation and to bring swift condemnation. The influence this exerted over the individual was not without considerable value to society.

More in particular, however, did it benefit the family. In point of fact the enforcement of common group standards in its regard played a very considerable part in creating this situation. If a group member was irresponsible enough to desert his family and leave it in want, or otherwise neglect his familial duties, he could only have expected that the others would condemn him for his conduct. Should he still persist in his neglect, and exempt himself from the observance of the common standards of conduct, he could but expect to be outlawed by the others, if not even driven from the community. Undoubtedly this whole situation brought a tremendous pressure to bear upon social life that went far indeed in stabilizing community life and in integrating the family.

Racial and Kinship Bonds.—Commonly, too, in these small and stable groups of the past the bonds of race and kinship were much in evidence. And these bonds served not only to bind the peoples into most intimate relationships but also exercised a powerful and rather direct control over family life. Members of the same race are attracted towards each other quite apart from distinctions among them. Besides such similarities as language, and racial customs and habits, there are usually various ambitions, affections, and prejudices more or less common to the members of the group. These tend to draw the individuals together, to create mutual interests between the group and those who compose it. As a rule there is little, if any, undermining of family traditions and sentiments in these stable racial groups of the past. Whether otherwise beneficial or not, intermarriage within their own racial group tended to preserve the same family pattern, and this fact undoubtedly made for familial stability among them. On the contrary, one could hardly expect that a marriage between two with strikingly different racial characteristics would normally have such stability. Such an attempt to combine family patterns might readily end in a clash with resultant anarchy in the home.

Even a more intimate and stronger bond was found in the case of the large kinship groups that were quite universal in the stable agricultural conditions of an earlier day. Of all connections, ''family stock'' is perhaps the most natural and enduring. It primarily grows out of the fact of physical descent. Its basic foundations seem stronger in some individuals, and even in whole peoples, than in others. Wherever it exists, it undoubtedly has a special value as an incentive to the individual to preserve the honor of the family name. This involves a healthy reaction upon family life. Family pride will make an individual hesitate in times of temptation and will strengthen him whenever heroic sacrifice is required. It acts as a restraint on his conduct, checking rash impulses. Should one member of the group weaken in his resolve, he feels the pressure brought to bear on him by the others to uphold the traditions, the ideals, and good name of the kinship group.

Thus, in various ways, the cultural stability of the social organism of an earlier day contributed towards the construction and maintenance of a stable and highly integrated family life. But there were other factors at work in the community that also helped family life. At least one or the other of these must be given brief mention. They are all products of Christianity.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL INTEGRATION

It has already been noted how the doctrines of Christianity with regard to marriage and the family served to integrate the home. So too, were the doctrines of Christianity generally of an integrating character. And this was not without influence on the family in particular as well as on the community in general.

Beginning its activity among the disintegrated elements of the pagan Greco-Roman world, Christianity speedily builded a civilization that was the antithesis of the broken-down paganism it had found. As a religion, a philosophy of life, Christianity is essentially integrating. Where it is really a living, vital force among a people, it makes for mental homogeneity and for sameness of morals, two strongly binding forces. Moreover, it intertwines all relations with the powerful ties of love. The integrated Christianity of the Middle Ages was such a vital force, knitting the social elements into enduring tissue and cementing the social organism into a compact whole. To appreciate its results, a brief consideration of the civilization that preceded it, and upon which it in turn was builded, will be helpful.

Greco-Roman Paganism Essentially an Individualistic and Disintegrating Force.—The characteristic of the later Greco-Roman civilization was individualism and its twin-born sister, selfishness. Individualistic selfishness lightly disregards, for the sake of personal gratification or advantage, social duties or the rights and feelings of others. The individual becomes the be-all and end-all of existence. His happiness and selfish interests become the sole criterion of human welfare. Greek philosophy was essentially individualistic. Naturally Greek conduct became so too. Roman militarism was selfish; in fact it was selfishly cruel. Moreover selfishness and sensuality are always most intimately related. Thus, individualism, selfishness, and sensuality grew apace. They combined to form an ever-swelling tide that could not but prove detrimental to Greco-Roman civilization. Individualistic thought was the guiding spirit. The selfish and not the social, was predominant. The sensual tended to swamp the spiritual. Disturbed by prevailing mental confusion, weakened by sensuality, and wearied with self, paganism could not stand. Life was purposeless and unsatisfying. There was nothing to restrain the capricious whim or impulse. Both individual and society suffered. Greco-Roman civilization became sick to the heart's core. Particularly among the upper classes did its vital cell, the family, become affected and the disintegration was soon under way.

Christianity Essentially a Social and Integrating Force. —In the dying embers of a disintegrating paganism, Christianity rooted its integrating ideals. They were characterized by the unselfish rather than by the selfish. They were social rather than individualistic. The spiritual was placed above the material. Definite aims and noble ideals replaced aimlessness of life. Excessive self-gratification was opposed by reasonable self-sacrifice and self-denial. Mental homogeneity took the place of the mental confusion of individualistic thought, while similarity of *mores* was substituted for individualistic conduct. The effect was individual contentment and satisfaction, social organization and integration. And these effects also showed themselves in the family.

There was stress, first of all, upon the fundamental Christian law of love of God and fellow-man. This not only promoted the common good, and thus served to integrate society, but it also naturally tended to draw the individual out of his selfish shell; it counteracted his selfish individualism. It was this same law of Christian love that brought the individual to a realization of the values of self-forgetful altruistic idealism, that taught him the beauty of self-sacrifice for neighbor out of love of God, and that gave deep meaning to his existence and satisfying contentment to his life, by answering the deeper needs and yearnings of human nature. For the soul is indeed naturally Christian. The sacrifice of self for God and neighbor that Christian love demands, amply repays the individual with an abundance of higher self-realization. It satisfies his higher self while it counteracts the unsocial in him. It socializes the individual and thereby makes for group integration.

By no means, therefore, did Christianity obliterate the individual. Contrarily, it always upheld a reasonable self-regard as altogether in place. Taken in a sense of rational deliberate desire for one's own welfare and for whatever will promote it, individualism is in reality Christian both in origin and in essence. It is founded on the Christian doctrine of the value of the individual and of the equality in dignity and destiny, as well as equality before the moral law, of all human kind. Such self-regard, however, always stops short of injustice or uncharity towards others, and goes beyond this to the point of habitual willingness to sacrifice, within reasonable limits, one's own interests and pleasures for the welfare of one's fellows.

Mental and Moral Homogeneity.—By means also of mental homogeneity and sameness of moral standards Christianity integrated the medieval community. Christian thought-life of the time was dominant and it was fundamentally the same for all. In moral doctrines and in aims of life there was not only similarity but even identity. As a result there was a community of mental interests that, in turn, made for a striking similarity of conduct. The individual's behavior is greatly influenced by whatever is in his mind. Like-mindedness on the part of those who compose a group goes very far in creating like-behavior in the group. Hence, by means of her sameness of fundamental doctrines Christianity went far in making the people alike in their many and varied relations of life. This naturally resulted in a highly integrated medieval community and in a well-organized family life.

The Church and the Effectiveness of Christian Doctrine.—The Church, of course, was the outstanding institution in making Christianity effective. She led the way in making Christian doctrine a vital force in the lives of the people. As the organized expression of Christianity, this foremost institution of the Middle Ages did not rest satisfied with merely preserving all the doctrines of Christianity, but also most actively sought to make them a force that should permeate the whole of civilization. This she did by her teaching and also by means of her sanctions.

As teacher of the age, the Church stocked the mental community with the Christian view of life. In season and out, she taught the people the truths of Christianity, interpreting them and pointing out their application in the relations of daily life. She did not, therefore, leave to the masses the impossible task of rationalizing or philosophizing their ethical problems of life, but gave them a definite code of ethics. And her standards were the same for all, irrespective of status or group affiliation. There was no allowance for exceptions, no permission for double standards; there was one law, one common standard for all. The natural result was a common group *mores* and striking similarity. This integrated the community and, in turn, also affected the home.

To this teaching of a common moral law to the people of the day the Church also added her compelling sanctions, her compulsions of love and of fear in order to make the law effective. She made the individual directly answerable to God, instead of to another individual or to any human institution.

She controlled more through a sense of responsibility than through the influence of any external pressure. The Church taught incessantly that anti-social conduct was wrong, not because the group condemned it, but because of the disapproval of an all-seeing supreme law-maker. And in the Middle Ages of Faith these sanctions were very effective.

Thus in many ways the Church, through effective teaching of the essentially integrating and social doctrines of Christianity, created a thoroughly organized community that, in turn, did much to integrate the families that were ingrained therein. Still, while the system of the Church did produce an integrated and stable society, it by no means excluded social progress. Rather the system resulted in a happy combination that assured both social orderliness and social progress.

Medieval Society Stable but Not Static.—While the Church disapproved of an excessive individualism that was disturbing and disrupting to society, she did not approve of a static situation that excluded social progress. She sought to balance all relations so as to assure a stable social progress. And, quite aside from any special prerogative that she claimed, the Church had the social heritage of the race and the experience of the ages to draw on. Preceding the Middle Ages, she had come into contact with most varied peoples, ranging from the uncouth barbarian to the effete Roman; she knew the essentials of social progress.

The principle that guided the Church in her activity was tersely summed up in the dictum of St. Augustine: ‘‘In things necessary, unity; in things doubtful, liberty; in all things, charity.’’ The ‘‘unity in things necessary’’ made certain that no fundamentals of social life were discarded. All had to accept these fundamentals. That practically precluded all possibility for racial retrogression. All the good things of the social heritage of the race were preserved. The individual was not allowed, because of a desire for selfish ease, to reject anything essential. Thus, with regard to the family, social evolution or racial experience had repeatedly proved the contentions of religion that unity, indissolubility, and sanctity were essential requisites for a wholesome family life. Hence in such matters there was to be no liberty, no experimentation. Consequently there was no retrogression. And this was the first essential for further social progress.

By her "liberty in things doubtful," furthermore, the Church opened wide the gates that stood ahead. She left every leeway for social progress. She left a vast arena for mental competition and struggle, for contesting debate and experiment. Her many and wonderful universities of the Middle Ages are witness to her active interest in this open field. And the facts of history give testimony of the results of that interest. They show a civilization reared upon that of the decadent Roman and the untutored barbarian that has made some even refer to the thirteenth as the greatest of centuries.[2] It was by unswervingly holding to all fundamental Christian principles, and so preserving the social heritage of the past, as well as by actively encouraging further progress, that the Church built this remarkable civilization.

A Civilization of Vows.—Another characteristic of the stable and progressive civilization of the Middle Ages deserving of special mention is the vow. Not only the Christian family but all Medievalism was based upon the ideal of the vow; it was a civilization of vows. This lent a mighty influence to social stability and, in a special way, strengthened the family. With a veritable civilization of vows, with the vow the normal and expected thing, it was relatively easy for the people to live up to their marriage promises.

The notion of the vow was ingrained in the social mind of the Middle Ages and the entire social structure was welded together by it. Thus, the whole of what we call chivalry was really one great vow. The knight's vow was deeply significant and was, moreover, beautifully clothed with religious ceremonial. So, too, was the profession of the marriage vow looked upon as an essentially religious act. The couple plighted their troth at the foot of the altar and sealed the promise by assistance at the highest act of their religion, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and by the reception of Communion. Even in the position of the guildsman were found the essentials of the vow; namely, the basic notion of a free choice of a fixed state. The whole social atmosphere surrounding the trade-man's entrance into the guild was full of the sense of free personal decision. His entrance into the guild was altogether voluntary, but, once a member, he found himself responsible for a very real loyalty and discipline. Most sacred of all, however, were the monastic vows. They were solemn promises made directly to God by which the individual voluntarily took upon himself the obligation of perpetual chastity, poverty, and obedience. He thereby opposed the three most powerful drives in human nature, namely, the impulses of sex, acquisitiveness, and self-assertion. This he did for his own spiritual welfare and for the example it afforded to others. In Benedictine monasticism there was another vow, and one of highest social importance, namely, stability. It was one of the most primary influences in the creation of the stability of medieval Europe. In writing his rule, 526 A. D., St. Benedict had stressed the idea of stability in its very prologue. The notion became characteristic of Benedictinism and to this day the followers of Benedict make a special vow of stability, binding them for life to the monastery of their profession. This vow definitely checked the roving instinct. It rooted monk and monastery in the soil. As these monastic foundations were planted in the more primeval parts of Europe, the roving barbarians came to settle around them. These barbarians were first taught the rudiments of agriculture and the values of a settled mode of life. Thus the first and fundamental step in their civilization had been taken, and the civilizing process was under way. As higher educational facilities were gradually added, the barbarians also received the benefits of these instruments of socialization.

---

[2] Walsh, J. J., *The Thirteenth the Greatest of Centuries.*

Upon these solemn pledges—feudal, marital, monastic—was medievalism founded. And they formed a solid and satisfying foundation. Before the vow, the unsatisfying system of slavery, shorn alike of honor and of freedom, had prevailed. After it came the ramshackle breakdown of contract, deficient alike in fixity and permanence. Thus divorce has so extensively become a part of our very civilization to-day that many make the civil marriage contract not only with a skeptical attitude but with determination to break it if serious difficulty arises. Christian medievalism however combined freedom and fixity into harmonious unison in the ideal of the vow as a voluntary, but most sacred and binding promise. And in such a civilization of vows the marriage promise was easily kept. The situation greatly bolstered up the home.[3]

The Community Complex.—Christianity, therefore, in many different ways, added to the stable and integrated civilization of medieval Europe. In fact, through her organized medium of expression, the Church, she created medievalism. The Church's monastic system, first of all, led the roving barbarian to settle down to the habituated life of agriculture. Then, as teacher of the age, the Church brought about the mental homogeneity of the time and was accountable for its common group standards and *mores*. In other words, she formed a vast community of interests, both cultural and intellectual. These, in turn, cultivated the affectional and emotional in the individual. All resulted in cementing the social organism into an integrated whole, into a compact community complex. By sympathetic radiation, or the copying of one another's notions; by imitation, or copying one another's actions; by social suggestion, or copying one another's ideas, were the community members made alike and drawn towards one another. By cultural stability, by mental homogeneity, and by emotional harmony were all community elements knitted together. The result was a highly integrated social organism. And, in turn, the family also was integrated. Because of their intimate relationship to the social organism, the familial units were merged into the community complex. They were embedded in the stable social structure.

---

[3] Chesterton, G. K., *The Superstition of Divorce*, Ch. VI.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. Has the Chinese family been merely stable or also static?
2. What elements in Chinese culture would help to account for the integrated Chinese family?
3. Can you give examples of stable family life among the American Indians?
4. Are families of the agricultural stage of civilization more stable than those of the hunting stage?
5. Do pioneer conditions make for familial integration or disintegration?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHESTERTON, G. K., *The Superstition of Divorce.*
GASQUET, O. S. B., A. CARD., *Parish Life in Medieval England.*
O'HARA, E. V., *The Church and the Country Community,* Ch. III.
SCHMIEDELER, E., *The Industrial Revolution and the Home.*
SIMS, N. L., *Elements of Rural Sociology,* Ch. X.
QUEEN, S. A., *Social Work in the Light of History,* Ch. XIV.

PART II

FAMILY DISINTEGRATION

FAMILY DISINTEGRATION

The cultural stability and mental homogeneity of the social organism in general and of the family in particular, described in the preceding section, served to bind groups together and to provide ample resources wherewith to nourish and vitalize the integrating bonds of love. Social pressure and religious sanctions also helped to stabilize and integrate group life. Undoubtedly, this situation was at its height in the Middle Ages. As a functioning social institution the family, in all likelihood, reached during that age the highest point it has ever attained. Slowly and laboriously, yet with unfaltering steadiness and certainty, did the Church reconstruct the disintegrated family life of Roman society and uplift that of the barbaric invader.

Medieval homes, indeed, were not perfect. Nor was the society of the time perfect. Though no homes were broken by divorce, there were of course such as were broken by death. In spite of all family bonds and religious influences as well, there was some family friction. A certain amount will always result from the ordinary process of life and from the normal interaction of human beings. Hence, there was also some social and familial disorganization or partial disintegration. But the characteristic of the period was stability in the family, and, in fact, in the entire social organism. As a consequence, the purposes of the family were well tended to and faithfully carried out, since the success of the family depends in great part upon the degree of inherent integration.

Yet, even while family life was at its height, certain forces at work within the social fabric gradually weakened it and eventually led to considerable disorganization. Gradually the various institutional groups felt the influence of these forces. The first was the Church, the largest of them all. The last was the family, the very cell of society, and the smallest of them all.

Powerful though these social influences were, society had been so thoroughly organized that the adverse forces could only gradually make their disturbing influence felt within the social organism. But eventually even the home, not only ingrained in the social organism but also based upon strong natural foundations, began to show signs of decay. More recently these signs have become unmistakably clear. The destructive process is apparent to all who care to see. The family has lost many of its former functions, and its bonds have been greatly weakened. There is much truth, indeed, in the statement of Professor Ogburn which follows his reference to the many functions of the family of the past:[1] "Within the past century there has been a precipitous fall from this pinnacle." Certainly, many a home is not the permanent unit so commonly found in the Middle Ages, or even in so recent times as fifty or a hundred years ago. In fact, this stable institution of the past seems on trial to-day. Its characteristic mark in modern times is instability or mobility, rather than stability. And its functions have suffered correspondingly.

The effects show themselves in various ways. Frequently the father is shorn of his power, the mother is no longer queen of the domestic world, the child is in revolt. There is parental irresponsibility, and youthful precocity. With an ever-mounting divorce rate, and with desertion on the increase, there are broken homes, unhappy homes, unsuccessful homes. With a decreasing birth-rate there are fewer children in homes. There are homeless children and childless homes. In many an instance the purpose of the family goes unfulfilled. Such, briefly, is the story statistics have written in this modern day; such the picture, in broad outline at least, that even a cursory reading of the daily paper suggests. The picture, it is true, can be overdrawn. Beautiful home-life there is, too. There are homes as ideal as ever any in the past. Yet, undeniably, there is much domestic discord, much familial change and instability.

---

[1] Ogburn, W. F., "Our Social Heritage" *Survey Graphic*, Dec. 1927, p. 278.

Various factors are implicated in this change. Many and complicated have become the forces at work, acting and reacting upon each other, silently and even imperceptibly tending to undermine the social organism and all its vital parts. The fundamental forces, however, are such factors as individualism, rationalism, the Industrial Revolution, immigration, and a faulty and unwholesome romanticism. Arising at different times, and to a great extent one from the other, they have developed their individual effectiveness and have to-day combined their forces in a mighty stream that is seriously disturbing organized society. In the following chapters attention will be given first of all to these root causes, and then to a somewhat detailed study of their effects.

CHAPTER V

Roots of Modern Social Change

Some knowledge of the influence of the root sources of modern social instability on society generally, is necessary in order to appreciate their effects on the home. Undoubtedly, the most fundamental source, and also the oldest in point of time, is individualism. It has been highly instrumental in fostering social and familial disintegration.

Individualism.—By individualism is meant the tendency towards the complete freedom of the individual from group-control. The wishes of the individual rather than those of the group become paramount. The independence of human units rather than their interdependence is emphasized. As was the case in Greece and Rome, so too is the more recent individualism identical with, or most intimately related to, selfishness. Whether we speak of it in terms of self-realization, self-expression, self-gratification, or self-interest, wherever this individualistic spirit is found in excess, selfishness is its motivating principle. Selfishness is of its very essence. Self rather than the common good is stressed. The individual rather than the social predominates. It is quite the reverse of the Christian law of charity which places the love of God and neighbor foremost. The tendency of individualism, however, is to place self first and God and his law, and the neighbor and his rights, second. It thus offends by excessive stress upon the individual or upon self, and by allowing the individual to trespass upon the rights of his neighbor. He need not discipline himself for the sake of the common good.

The individualistic spirit rampant to-day in society and in the family has had a long and continuous growth. It is the result of a great movement that has characterized the Western world for four centuries and more, slowly but surely penetrating the entire social system. All social institutions have been more or less affected. All relationships, whether religious, governmental, industrial, educational, or familial, as well as the very structure of society itself have felt its disintegrating effect.

The Church and Individualism.—Individualism first reached the harmful heights of excess in the field of religion. Since the Church was both the largest and most influential social institution of the time, it was not surprising that it was the first to feel the effect as this new disintegrating principle bored its way into the social organism. Even by the first quarter of the sixteenth-century it had so far undermined Christian charity that the success of the religious revolt was rendered possible. Large groups withdrew themselves from the Church that had created medieval civilization. These no longer recognized the authority of the Church, either in the field of faith or of morals. Moreover, they withdrew themselves from the Church's control. According to a new principle then announced, the authority of the Church was to be supplanted by the authority of the individual. Fortunately for society, the theory was only gradually put into practice and has never really been carried out to its full extent. Yet it has done much harm. It has replaced for many the mental and moral homogeneity of medieval times with the mental and moral heterogeneity of modern society.

The Christian principle that had preceded the revolt and was enunciated, for instance, in the words of St. Augustine, had assured complete harmony or mental homogeneity in matters essential. It had served to integrate society. The new principle now set forth—that the individual was to become the guide of his own thought—led to mental dissimilarity and intellectual differences. In as far as such a principle is actually carried out, it compels division. It is intrinsically

3-1303-00005-4669

disintegrating. It tells everyone that he can decide his own beliefs, even in matters most necessary and essential. Individualism tells him that he can form his own philosophy of life and make his own religion. Such a principle is essentially dissolvent and separative. Hence, with the ''liberty in things doubtful'' of St. Augustine, extended to ''liberty in all things mental,'' the ''unity in things necessary'' became impossible of fulfilment. The door was open to retrogression. The inevitable result was some fundamental disorganization.

Moreover, the individual was not only to be the interpreter of his own aims of life, he was also to be the author of his own moral code. The Church could no longer enforce with her sanctions a definite code. As far as the teaching authority and the social control of the Church were concerned, the individual was really free to do, as well as to believe, what he pleased. In principle, the Church did not exist as an institution for the individual; he was his own church. In as far as this principle was actually put into practice, it led to the substitution of moral heterogeneity or dissimilarity, for moral similarity and likeness. It had a vitiating effect upon human conduct. It showed itself even within the family circle. In fact, it disturbed all human relations. As MacManus[1] puts it, this spirit of individualism ''overturns standards of virtue and induces the individual intellect to accept vicious substitutes with complaisance. It penetrates every nook, corner, and cranny of the social structure and poisons human conduct in all of the relations. It invariably invades the home first and establishes the rule of the flesh between man and wife. It creeps into the secrecy and the sacredness of the nuptial chamber and perverts the primal relation. It enters into the very womb of woman. It defeats the very law of creation. . . . It is not necessary to prove these assertions. They are proved. Society today is a network of surrenders, so far as the ancient Christian standards of conduct are concerned. The conveniences substituted by modern life scarcely produce a qualm of doubt and uncertainty.''

---

[1] MacManus, T. F., "The Nadir of Nothingness," *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. CXLI, p. 602.

In the case of the overwhelming majority of individuals, a purely human and individual code of ethics will not stand the test of practical, everyday application. Only too readily will they construct a code which accommodates itself to their weaknesses, to their personal convenience and indulgence. Man needs to regulate his life according to sanctions outside and beyond himself.

Again, the stress that the new individualism put upon the individual opened wide the door for a change in the all-important Christian law indicated in the final words of the quotation from Augustine, ''In all things charity.'' Though the Christian law makes due allowance for a reasonable self-regard on the part of the individual, it is primarily a law of the love of God and fellow-man. An excessive individualism necessarily stresses self-love and weakens other-love. And, in so doing it contributes to social disintegration.

The Church, too, lost much of its power of social control. The medieval Church had exercised considerable control over the individual. But the new principles did not make allowance for such on the part of those who withdrew themselves from the Church. Hence, the more the individualistic principle was carried out, the greater grew the need for the substitution of control by some other institution. The state succeeded the Church in this. In ever-increasing measure it was called upon to control the overt conduct of the individual. Marriage laws, for instance, were transferred to the state. The civil contract was substituted for the solemn vow.

The law indeed has its values. But its limitations are likewise self-evident. While law can bind the individual, it can bind him only in part. It can never have the far-reaching effect of a religious sense of responsibility or obligation. The replacement of the vow by the civil contract was, furthermore, the substitution of a less for a greater social force. The civil contract is by nature devoid of the fixity and permanence of the vow. A civilization of vows has a far more stable basis than a civilization of contracts. The contract can usually be rescinded at the will of the contracting parties; the vow can ordinarily not be so revoked. And this change was particularly harmful to the family. With the vow went the three fundamentals of marriage. Indissolubility, unity, and sanctity—the very cornerstones of the family—were discarded. They were replaced by a flimsy, unstable, and changeable substitute, namely, the civil contract. Slowly but surely the superstructure of the home began to show the inevitable effect. To-day the signs of decay are unmistakable. The ever-increasing number of broken homes is proof incontestable.

Individualism and Other Social Institutions.—The individualistic spirit affected not only the Church but penetrated also into other social institutions. It became the *Zeitgeist* of the time. In economic relations, for example, an excessive individualism gave rise to the exaggerated *laissez-faire* policy of modern industrialism. Its basic assumption was that whenever self-interest is pursued, the common good is promoted. Thus, the theory became current that each person should be free to work for his own livelihood in accordance with his own interests and wishes and without any arbitrary interference from his fellows. In protest against past regulation by guild or state, a ''hands off'' policy was advocated by the new industry, and any attitude of control by the government was condemned as paternalistic, and speedily resented as an undue interference with private rights. Naturally, this attitude led to an economic and industrial situation that unmistakably showed both the fallacy of such uncontrolled freedom and the positive need of some regulation for the protection of the weak against the strong. The true democratic ideal stands for a maximum of order with a minimum of control. But here as elsewhere, the tendency of individualism was to resent even the necessary minimum of control. Among other results of this individualistic economic policy, there has been much violation of the fundamental law of

Christian love as well as of fundamental justice. And this very trend has likewise had a disturbing effect upon society. It served to extend the growth of the principle of individualism throughout the rest of the social realm, and penetrated even into its most vital parts.

Individualism likewise manifested itself in the field of government. An otherwise healthy spirit of democracy in this manner culminated at times in such excesses as those of the French Revolution. And these again reacted upon other parts of the social organism. More and more did the individualistic spirit make its effect felt throughout the whole field of human relations.

With all the damage that has actually been done through the growth of this new spirit, the fact remains that in practice it has never really been carried out to the fullest extent. It has always done its work gradually and over a considerable period of time. This is due in part to the fact that the masses simply do not think. They do not form their own philosophies of life as the individualistic spirit would have them do. Rather do they follow leaders, contentedly and naturally, if the leaders be good and wise. Moreover, for centuries in the past, the culture of the masses was very stable. They were carried forward by the mass habits of common life. There was little change to create turmoil and disturb them. They were influenced by the traditions and conventions, the customs and habits of centuries. They were controlled by the power of social pressure. Yet, from its very beginning, the new principle was not without some disturbing influence, and at times this influence was even extremly disastrous.

To-day this socially destructive individualistic spirit is abroad, and, to no small extent, beyond the pale of social control. Its harmful effects are very much in evidence to those in the watch towers. It has incessantly kept eating away within the social organism. It is the moth in the fabric of modern life. It has become the subconscious assumption, the very basis of many of our current theories and policies. Its spirit permeates the very atmosphere and infests every phase of life. Its norm of human welfare is the happiness of the individual rather than the promotion of the common good. An utterly untenable and fallacious principle of social philosophy, it is particularly harmful to-day when the complexity of modern relations has enormously augmented the interdependence of mankind. Stress upon socialization is needed far more to-day than emphasis upon individualization. As long as an excessive individualism is allowed to continue within the social organism, disorganization will go on apace. It will continue irresistibly to create disssimilarity and to foster selfishness. And that will not only vitiate the general social structure but all of its individual parts, including its most fundamental unit, the family.

In course of time other developments have arisen and closely allied themselves with individualism, hastening the disintegration process. They gave impetus, for instance, to a false spirit of liberty amounting to license. They helped furnish means of indulgence. They gave new media of intercommunication. They made for instability. More detailed attention will be given to at least some of these matters in later parts. One of these root sources of change was rationalism. It is deserving of special attention.

RATIONALISM

The rationalistic movement arose in the eighteenth century. The new tendency became known as ''rationalism'' because its votaries sought to make everything rational, or reasonable. The term, ''New Science'' or ''New Scientific Spirit'' is used with equal justice. Both science and the fine arts had flowered in the sixteenth century.[2] In the eighteenth century, however, the fine arts were much neglected while science was given renewed impetus.[3] The various sciences were cultivated but eventually much stress was placed upon the physical sciences while the social sciences were comparatively neglected. The effect was thus socially detrimental. The rationalistic movement gave rise to a skeptical spirit that in turn led to some harmful social results. Moreover, it led to a rationalizing of conduct that proved detrimental to society and to all of its different institutions. Allying itself with the individualistic spirit, the rationalistic spirit has contributed in no small part to the present disturbed condition of society and of the home.

---

[2] Hayes, C. J., *A Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. I, p. 414.

[3] Ibid.

Origin and Growth in the Eighteenth Century.—Rene Descartes is rightly considered one of the main popularizers of the new scientific spirit. The *encyclopedists* generally also pleaded its cause. English deism not only had a significant bearing on the religious situation in the eighteenth century, but also was part and parcel of the scientific and intellectual spirit of the times. Seeing and believing for one's self were the twin principles of the new scientific method. One must take nothing for granted, they insisted. Rather, question everything. Think boldly. Seek new knowledge by actual experiment. In a word, be skeptical. Such were the essentials of their doctrines. Applied to social relations this meant a substitution of reason for authority, a questioning of customs, conventions and beliefs. The movement grew rapidly, particularly in France. The eighteenth century scientist enjoyed great popularity. The New Science was encouraged in many ways, and proved to be a boon to mankind in various ways.

On the other hand, however, the very attitude of skepticism that the new movement engendered was not without considerable social harm. This was particularly the case as it filtered down through the masses and was encouraged even in the young. Original thought on their part commonly produced barren results. By means of their attempt to reason out things they often laid the old aside and put nothing new in its place. In not a few cases the result was simply mental confusion, even in fundamental and essential matters. Many were left without definite aims or objectives, without a common sense code of morals or a general philosophy of life. Many developed a skeptical attitude and never got beyond that attitude. It left them without mental guide and compass. It left them to their whims and impulses and fancies. Naturally this attitude reflected itself in their conduct. Many were left undisciplined and without self-control and character.

But there was questioning not only of conventional beliefs but also of social customs. As the rationalistic spirit entered the realm of social relations, there developed a veritable cult of change. More and more was the social world conceived of as dynamic and progressive rather than relatively fixed and stable. A disbelief, for instance, grew up in the hoary political institutions of the past, and radical alterations were made. Again, the notion became more and more prevalent that the old system of social classes was unreasonable, and a leveling of classes ensued. In France this was brought to a climax in the French Revolution. In the field of religion the change also made itself felt. A new philosophy of pragmatism gained ground, popularizing the notion that the value of moral and religious ideals is to be judged solely by their practical effects, that is, by the way they work. Already in the early sixteenth century was this note struck in the political field in Machiavelli's *Prince,* wherein he justified on the part of the ruler any means that might achieve his purpose. Much the same notion was carried over into other fields.

To a greater extent, however, did religion suffer with the growth of the evolutionary theory. The new doctrine radically changed some of the Christian groups and left others not unscathed. A considerable impetus was given to agnosticism and skepticism. The disintegrating principle of individualism was given renewed impetus.

Another harmful result of the new scientific spirit was the tendency that developed on the part of some to sneer at social conventions, to undervalue the traditions of the race, and to disregard the worth of the customs and controls of the past. By such, change was taken to be identical with progress. The old was simply considered valueless by the mere fact of its age. The human race for thousands of years had just been a blind leader of the blind. The original thought of some shallow individual, or even mere child, was placed above the experience of the race. And here again, the result was frequently that, as the old was lightly set aside, nothing adequate was put in its place.

So went the cult of change. Such attitudes, and conduct in accordance with them, could only result in much social harm and in disorganization. The new spirit penetrated the whole social structure and eventually made its discordant influence felt within the home as well as in other social institutions.

The Rationalization of Conduct.—Very derogatory from a social standpoint were the effects of the rationalistic movement as they manifested themselves in efforts of many to substitute rational guidance in the place of control of behavior by *mores* and authority. While progress lies in that direction, this new spirit often led to disrespect for control and even outright contempt for authority in all units of society. This has become particularly noticeable in recent years. ''Almost within the life of this generation,'' says Dr. Bruno,[4] ''reason has taken the place of authority as the guide to behavior. When the reason for sex and marital acts is to be found in their appeal to the individual judgment, it is obvious that people will show less uniformity than when they act in response to vigorous authority. One does not need a profound knowledge of psychology to predict that in such a situation decisions would be made, very largely, not in accordance with the abstract merits of the case, but in accordance with desire. One with any intelligence can usually find a good reason for doing the thing he wants to do. To the first advocates of the rational basis of ethics, the substitution of reason for authority appeared as the enfranchisement of the human soul. If men were free to create the morality they needed, there was no reason, it was argued, why the millenium should not immediately be ushered in. It is no disservice to reason to point out the fallacy of any such expectations: to point out that while such a result, somewhat modified perhaps, might happen in many individuals, there is nothing contained in such a program to insure that such a result would take place universally.'' These words apply not only to marital or familial relations but also to all other social relations as well. Conduct guided by reason will not invariably control the powerful instinctive drives of man.

---

[4] Bruno, F. J., "The Meaning of the Conference." *The Family*, Dec. 1927, p. 266.

The facts of life have surely abundantly shown that freedom of thought does not assure conduct guided by truth. Particularly is this the case with the immature and the ignorant. Only too frequently does their freedom eventuate in sheer unrestraint, in a flouting of legitimate authority, and in the advocacy and enjoyment of a freedom without restraint. Selfish desire, rather than the abstract merits of the case, renders the decision. There is need for an objective science of ethics and for social control and moral compulsion. Society cannot stand permanently with them.

Nineteenth-Century Development.—The spirit of the new science that began in the eighteenth century continued in the nineteenth with unabated vigor. A new feature, however, was added. There was during the latter century exceptional advance in the field of applied science. It brought about the Industrial Revolution. Attention will be given this great factor in a special chapter. Suffice it here but briefly to point out the results of the application of scientific discoveries and inventions to practical uses in ministering to the health and comfort of the masses. It led in time to a faulty romanticism and a pleasure philosophy of life that have become socially harmful and detrimental.

Health of body gradually came to be looked upon by many as more important than health of soul. The material was exalted at the expense of the spiritual. The common people in great numbers began to enjoy comforts and conveniences unknown to the royalty of ages gone by. Material comfort was exalted, with the result that the old Christian ideas of sacrifice and penance began to lose their influence in the lives of many. This led to a decrease of self-discipline on the part of many and to a weakening of the hardy social virtues. And as self-discipline decreased, selfishness increased. The creed of softness that grew up, constantly fed the individualistic *Zeitgeist* of the time. The ultimate result has been that a veritable philosophy of pleasure permeates the social organism, while moral stamina, character, and the virile virtues have lost caste. A life of thrills has become the ambition of many. And this spirit has penetrated even within the portals of the home.

Yet, neither the home in particular nor society in general can stand long upon a mere pleasure basis. Life is a job rather than a joy-ride. Institutional life is a discipline rather than a round of thrills. Social institutions, indeed, answer man's needs and give him much self-satisfaction, but in turn they demand no small amount of discipline. Excessive pleasure, comfort, and ease, a soft creed and a pleasure philosophy of life make a shaky social foundation.

Another harmful result of the growth of luxury and comfort has been an undue stress upon the romantic side of life. This new romanticism has fostered effeminacy rather than manliness. It does not lend itself to the promotion of self-denial and self-discipline. Living in dream worlds rather than facing the realities of life does not prepare one for the tasks of life. Rather does it enthrone self in the place of the virile self-sacrificing virtues. And it thereby fosters social corruption.

Thus have individualism and rationalism in many different ways fostered social disintegration. And in disturbing the social organism they have also disorganized the family unit ingrained therein. Individualism is in principle socially disintegrating. It inevitably makes for mental and moral unlikeness. It puts self above society. Rationalism, too, readily becomes socially harmful, especially to the masses. It makes for skepticism, doubt, and confusion. It leads to mental heterogeneity. Moreover, in causing the growth of modern romanticism and of a pleasure philosophy of life, it has contributed to moral debasement. Separately and in combination have these fundamental causes gone far, indeed, in undermining the mental and moral homogeneity of an earlier day. And they are very active within the social fabric to-day. More recently has their effectiveness been greatly increased through alliance with another mighty factor, namely, the Industrial Revolution. We shall turn our attention to this subject in the next chapter.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. What further causes of modern family disintegration deserve mention?
2. What are the chief problems of the immigrant home?
3. Give some examples of an excessive individualism that would be harmful to a family group?
4. Is self-sacrifice opposed to self-realization?
5. What are the right views of individuality as opposed to the erroneous views prevailing at the present day?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bruno, F. J., *The Meaning of the Conference, The Family,* Dec., 1927.

Fletcher, M., *The Christian Family,* Ch. IV.

Hayés, C. J., *A Political and Social History of Modern Europe,* Vol. I, Ch. V; Vol. II, Ch. XXI.

Mowrer, E. R., *Family Disorganization,* Ch. VII.

Raymond, S., *Individualization of the Parent,* Nat'l Conf. of Soc. Wk., Vol. XXII, pp. 257–261.

Ward, P. J., "Our Fight Against the Pagan Ideas of Family Life," *N. C. W. C. Review,* Jan., 1930.

CHAPTER VI

The Industrial and Social Revolution

Social history is witness to a great cultural change that has marked the past century. It points to social upheavals more sudden than any of the past. The recent shift from muscle power to steam, electricity, and gasoline is rapidly creating a new order of things. It is begetting a new applied-science civilization. As a result, change has followed change. On the one hand, the great social institutions of the past have felt the magic touch of the transitional spirit of the age, and on the other, the individual members of human society have been affected in the minutest details and most fundamental habits of their lives. All human relationships have been more or less dislocated by the change. Old restraints of the past, no matter how useful they may have been, have given way in full or in part to this disturbing influence. The industrial factor has been fundamental in the change. Very properly, then, do we speak of the Industrial Revolution. The social changes brought about may well be called a social revolution. And a veritable domestic revolution has resulted in the home.

The Industrial Revolution the Cause of the Change.[1]—While other social forces have indeed played a part in the great social transition of recent times, the share contributed by industry has been both outstanding and basic. The real starting point of it all was mechanical invention. Inventive genius begot the machine. Power machinery led to the factory system. The modern city was the offspring of the factories. So complete was the transformation that it was no less than a revolution.

---

[1] Schmiedeler, E., *The Industrial Revolution and the Home.*

The birth place of this revolution was England; the time of birth approximately between 1770 and 1825. Speedily it reached out to the Old World and the New. While it attained its highest development in the city, it has not stopped there, but has also extended beyond. Though it has reached gigantic proportions, it is still evolving to-day. There is no evidence of decline. The spirit of change goes on apace. It made itself felt on a large scale in this country almost simultaneous with the date of the Civil War. Then it is that we first see a changing situation. The larger group began supplanting the smaller one; the stability of the past gave way to the mobility of the present. Around its other creation, the factory, the Industrial Revolution built the modern city, and is thus accountable for the drift from the country to the city and for the resultant instability. Its manifold inventions have increased facilities of transportation and mutiplied the possibilities of communication. A multiplicity of social contacts, undreamed of but a few decades ago, have become commonplace to-day. Inventions have almost annihilated space by land, sea, and sky. These carry man's ideas by telephone, wireless, and radio, with lightning speed and to most distant parts. Invention follows invention. More and more does Nature do man's bidding. And the end is not yet. All evidence points rather to increasing impetus than to decline.

These changes have not been without tremendous influence upon social life in general and that of the family in particular. The normal result of such change one would naturally expect to be social disorganization, general instability. Increasing mobility tends to break up the routine upon which the existing social order rests. Every new device that affects social life and routine is to that extent a disorganizing influence. New discoveries, new inventions, and new ideas tend to disturb the old order and to lead to social disorder.

As a result of this industrial change, millions came to have at their disposal means of transportation and communication which formerly they did not enjoy. Many began traveling long distances, receiving news of interest and hearing novel ideas, where formerly, by force of circumstances, they were more or less attached to the soil and cut off from contact with the great outside world, that is, with the world outside their own community. Many found themselves in new social situations. The smaller neighborhood and community groups began, on the one hand, to lose their former importance and prestige as well as their force of social pressure; on the other, millions who formerly were members of smaller communities now found themselves in large city groups. For them the former more intimate and personal relationships of the smaller group were replaced by the new and more complicated association of the larger one. Old habits, customs, and traditions were suddenly uprooted. Social restraint gradually weakened. Frequently the large new groups were so unstable that new instruments of social control could hardly be forged. More and more did the far weaker force of the law have to be called upon to restrain the individual.

Thus did the Industrial Revolution substitute a machinofacture system for a civilization of agriculture. The process of change has ruffled the social pattern; it has greatly disturbed the social situation. While this is true in general, the results vary greatly in particular groups or sections. Most striking, of course, are the differences found in the extremes of city and country. A more detailed study of these two extremes will better show both the effects and the extent of the great transition.

The Country Districts Least Affected.—While the Industrial Revolution has undoubtedly reached out to the country, its disturbing influence is not felt so much there as in the city. Very generally, rural districts have become more mobile in recent decades, but compared with urban parts, they are still relatively small and stable. As a result, the various ties that integrated rural peoples of the past are still much in evidence. Moreover, life is still based considerably upon habit, and there is no small amount of social pressure. The situation reacts to the good of the family.

In a study the writer recently made in a western agricultural district, he found groups in which strong racial ties were very much in evidence. In some cases there was little intermarriage with other races and, in fact, but limited contact with other peoples. This circumstance went far in preserving similar family patterns. The particular groups studied were of German descent and the intimate association of the members insured the group against any noticeable change of opinion regarding the traditions of large families, rigorous discipline, strong family sentiment, subordination of the individual to the common good of the family, to its economic security and success; in a word, to the traditions of a stable and highly integrated family life brought from the fatherland by the early pioneers. More casual observation suggests such strong racial groups to be quite common in the rural districts of this country. Wherever found, the powerful racial ties and close intermarriage are influential factors in binding the group members together, in upholding family patterns, and in strengthening the home.

Large kinship groups are also quite commonly found in rural parts of the United States. Very generally, after marriage, children settle down in their old community among their friends and relatives. This situation fosters a healthful sense of family pride for which the domestic world is the gainer. The constant face-to-face association incites all to uphold the familial traditions and to preserve the good name and honor of their kin. While this is another influence that bolsters up the family, it also strengthens the social fabric.

More common in the country, however, are the small community or neighborhood groups. Within these groups also, there is considerable intermarriage that reacts beneficially upon the family. Growing up together, meeting repeatedly at church, at school, and recreation, the young come to know each other thoroughly. Thus, when a young man and woman come to settle down to home-making, they begin with a common training and background, with the same social customs to guide them. Settling in the same general community, they have friends and relatives to help them. Moreover, there is a strong social pressure that serves to protect them. The small and stable community makes for social integration. There are still many such centers found in rural districts.

Again, there is the parish, or church group, which likewise affects many. Small in geographic area and binding its members with various ties, it brings about intimate acquaintanceship among the parishioners. There are still many such parishes in the country, having the characteristics of the small and stable social group. They exercise some influence in forming common group *mores* and habits. They simplify the selection of a mate. And in both of these ways do they naturally help the family.

These various ties, therefore, tend not only to bind and stabilize the larger social groups, but serve also to integrate the smaller or familial units ingrained within them. They foster similar habits, customs, and *mores,* all of which have an organizing rather than a disorganizing effect upon the social system.

A social restraint serving to protect and shield the individual is one of the most common and also most valuable influences resulting from all these primary group associations of the country. In these small rural communities murder, and far less than murder, will out. Any least suspicion of loose conduct, and much more so of infidelity, immediately sets the individual aside as one to be avoided, as one unfit for intimate association and contact with the group members. Even a brief period of residence in such a community unmistakably reveals this fact to the alert observer. Acquaintance is intimate, the eyes of the group are upon the individual. There is the power of rural and village gossip. It cannot be questioned that it makes many more wary and induces them to conform their conduct to the standards of the group. It serves as a powerful instrument of social control. Nor is the family the loser. Any least evidence of neglect of duty, familial, religious or otherwise, on the part of members of the community, still brings speedy condemnation to-day as in the past. Failure in rearing children, for instance, is there considered a disgrace. Should one or the other individual grow remiss, there is always present that social pressure, arising out of the common group standards and primary group association, that acts as a mighty force to keep such a one to his duty. This social force also undoubtedly affects the younger generation, helping parents to keep their children in the restraint of the straight and narrow path.

The situation, as described above, is borne out by the writer's own survey, while more casual and general observation strongly suggests this condition to be, in many respects, quite typical of rural sections. Undoubtedly, the common customs and *mores* of country groups, and the social restraint which they engender, are still very influential forces inducing both wholesome conduct and vital family life. At any rate, primary group influence is far more powerful in the country than it is in the city.

Some Social Disturbances in Rural Sections.—Yet, withal, it would be an exaggeration to say that the situation is still the same as it was before the Industrial Revolution, or as it was in colonial or medieval days. While the various group ties do remain in considerable strength and number, many of the groups at least have grown somewhat larger and have become more mobile. Hence there has been some waning of primary group control. Socially, too, there is some evident confusion. Parents strike an occasional note of uneasiness. There is complaint that the task of rearing children is more difficult than formerly. Again and again one hears it said that children ''seem different,'' and, especially in the case of the older ones, that they ''go too much,'' that they ''stray too far'' or ''spend too much,'' that ''it is increasingly difficult to make the home interesting for them.''

The symptoms, of course, are plain. The explanation that the apparent natural tendency of those getting on in life is to disparage the present in comparison with the past, will not suffice to waive the matter aside. Quite evidently the spirit of change and mobility, with the general social restlessness that has resulted, has found its way into the community. The old stability of the past is feeling the effect.

Thus, in the community there are increased means of communication. This implies increased contact with the outside world. As never before, new and strange ideas from the great outside world are finding their way into even far-distant rural communities, into the very homes. The result is ever the same: the newness wears off, while the old is no longer so dogmatically true. The more spirited young embrace the new; the older ones are inclined to cast their lot with the past. There is a clash between old and new, and between old and young. For the time there is disorder, instability, change. There is confusion and a waning of primary group pressure.

And yet, the main cause has not been mentioned, though it is well known to all. Undoubtedly, the automobile that has found its way into the farm so generally, more than any other single factor, has tended to make the community mobile. Moreover, other transportation facilities have increased. And even the growth of tenancy has affected the former stable situation.

While there is much evidence, therefore, of strong group ties in the rural districts and also proof of social pressure, it is likewise true that even there the Industrial Revolution is disturbing social conditions. Increased media of communication and transportation have increased social contacts and made for greater mobility. As a result, there is some consequent mental confusion. And in the general change the family has not remained untouched. Inherent in the social structure, the family is sensitive to social change.

Social Mobility at Its Height in the City.—The change has gone still farther in the city. This is but to be expected, since the city is the very headquarters of the Industrial Revolution. Means of communication and transportation are there abundantly within reach of the masses. Modern mobility has supplanted the stability of the past. Ever-crowded thoroughfares, crowded stores and places of amusement are common in the city. These are not to be found in the country. Compare, for instance, the situation in Chicago, where a traffic count showed that in rush periods 31,000 men and women pass the corner of State and Madison streets in one hour,[2] with the many rural localities where one may repeatedly drive a number of miles without meeting even a single person. This condition, of course, implies that there are many more secondary, and far fewer primary, contacts in the city than in the country. It also implies a weakening of group ties, a breakdown of customs and habits, and less effective social pressure. Very generally, the ties that still commonly bind the groups in the rural districts, are less influential in the city. In some instances they seem entirely lacking.

Thus, the racial bond does not seem so permanently strong in the city as in the country. There are, of course, many more immigrants in urban than in rural parts, but the city group generally is more heterogeneous than is the country community. There are, it is true, striking exceptions to this statement. In some instances we find special little racial worlds in which race influence is a very real social force. Frequently, at least the more recently arrived immigrants of a particular race will congregate in a common neighborhood and hold fast to their own language, traditions, habits, and beliefs. The situation usually makes for much face-to-face association and primary group pressure that is not without value to their family life. Thus, in Little Sicily, Chicago, not a single case of divorce or desertion was found recorded in the domestic relations or superior or circuit court. The Sicilians there live in a little world of their own and are effectively influenced by their prevailing code of conduct, by their common religious sentiments, and by their group standards. These preclude the evasion of family responsibilities by way of divorce or desertion or any other method. Yet, even here, the observance of their standards is rendered more difficult than it would otherwise be, by the fact that their own group is in immediate contact with communities that sanction such practices. Immigrants generally know that divorce is no longer under the ban of American customs. This is one of the reasons given by the immigrant parents why they fear assimilation on the part of their children. In the city, however, the members of these racial groups do not seem to remain there as long as they do in the country.

---

[2] Park, R. E. and Burgess, E. W., *The City*, p. 61.

To a far greater extent, however, has the kinship group broken down in the city than it has in the country. Kinship ties have lost much of their force and influence in urban parts. Groups of relatives are not so generally found living in the same neighborhood as in the rural districts. A factual study by the writer showed that the ties of kinship were very powerful in the rural group but almost nil in the city. Thus, in the rural group there were a number of families who had more than one-hundred relatives in the immediate vicinity. In the urban group the highest number for any family was twenty-five. And no other even approached that figure.

Again, stable neighborhood groups are not commonly found in the city. There is rather a growth of large and shifting populations that make for instability and for the multiplication of secondary contacts. An extreme example of such a mobile situation can be taken from the Lower East Side in New York City. Once the congested section, it is now one of the new districts, in which full time is given the pupils in school where formerly only part time was possible. One school ten years ago 99 per cent Jewish is now 99 per cent Italian.[3]

[3] Bowman, L. E., "Population Mobility and Community Organization," *Papers and Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Society*, p. 137.

Certainly there is little stability in such a community, but rather much mobility. And that prevents the formation of local customs and traditions that might serve to support the family.

Nor do the urban parish groups enjoy the primary group influences that those of the country do. Yet the parish bond still exercises considerable influence, particularly where it is found in the more stable parts of the city. At any rate, in Catholic parish groups, as the writer knows them, there seem to be some very real possibilities for group integration. Usually there is a parish school that regularly brings the children together and a church that generally insures repeated contact between the parishioners. Frequently there are also parish recreational facilities that foster face-to-face association and intimate acquaintanceship. Such church organizations as sodalities also play a part in this. Above all, however, the common beliefs both in matters of faith and morals make for common standards and similarity of views, and promote mental and moral homogeneity. The result of the whole situation is naturally a considerable amount of primary contact: the formation of common group *mores* and their enforcement upon the group members. And this result affects not only the individual, but reacts also upon the family, inasmuch as standards are maintained. That, for example, the resident of a parish who shirked his duties towards his family, should remain in good standing, is hardly to be expected.

Some parishes, it is true, are so large that the parishioners can not know one another well. Nor can the pastor know his flock. In some cases, too, parishes are located in very mobile parts of the city where there is a shifting of population. In such instances little opportunity for face-to-face association or for intimate acquaintanceship presents itself. Certainly there is not the standing around on the church green before and after services, for a renewal of acquaintance that was so common in earlier times. In other words, little social pressure is felt as far as these parish groups are concerned. But there is always that which is far more powerful, namely, the same group of doctrines in faith and in morals that promote mental and moral homogeneity. Nevertheless, while the influence of the parish tie is still considerable in the city, it is not so effective and far-reaching there as in the country.

All the group ties, therefore, are generally weaker in the city than in the country. City groups have become very mobile. Contacts have multiplied and many of them have become altogether casual and transitory. A noteworthy breakdown has taken place in customs and habits, in traditions and standards; and in the vast maze of modern mobility it is difficult to form new ones. An intensity of stimulations prevails, calculated almost of necessity to produce confusion. It does, in fact, produce actual demoralization, and that, both on the part of the individual and the social group. Even the serenity of a philosopher would naturally be disturbed. And the family, too, is undoubtedly affected.

A Weakening of Social Pressure.—As a result of the multiplication of secondary contacts, restraint through social pressure has become far less effective in the city than in the country. While it is true that in particular urban groups a certain amount of such control can still be brought to bear upon the individual, it is seldom, if ever, as forceful as in the rural districts, because the individual is not so much under the eyes of the group. Moreover, it is a simple matter to escape entirely the vigilant eye of one's immediate community and go where one is unknown and where no one in particular cares about one's conduct. Instead of being one compact little world, as is the case with the rural neighborhood, the city is rather a patchwork of many different worlds, with possibility of escape from one into another always at hand. Besides the usual business districts, for example, there are residential districts for rich, poor, and middle class. Again, there may be Italian, Polish, Negro, or other districts. A few minutes' ride by street-car, automobile or bus can bring one into an entirely different neighborhood, into a place where one may be entirely unacquainted. Under these circumstances there is not much question of common group standards, or of their enforcement through group control. At any rate, compared with rural parts, there is considerably less primary group pressure.

The Country Town Community.—The social situation of the country town is much more like that of the rural, than that of the urban districts. The means of communication, it is true, are somewhat more abundant in the town than in the strictly rural group. Yet, the various group ties are practically as forceful there as they are in country neighborhoods. Hence, the town has more of the nature of a primary than of a secondary group. There is much more face-to-face association there than could be expected in the city. There is the same tendency for gossips to be busied about the affairs of others that one finds so commonly in rural communities. Much evidence of common standards is at hand and of social pressure to enforce them. Conduct at all noticeably out of the ordinary could not expect to escape notice, while mere suspicion of a serious misstep might carry with it speedy punishment. Suspicion of any moral turpitude might leave its taint forever and make the marriage of an individual an utter impossibility in the community. Hence, home-life there is much like that of the country. The family and the social organism are generally much more integrated in the country town than they are in the city.

The Domestic Revolution.—The home has without doubt been greatly affected by the far-reaching social changes produced by the Industrial Revolution. Rooted, as it is, in the social organism, it cannot but be responsive to the change and mobility of the entire social system. While Frank N. Hagar quite rightly remarks that, ''For over two-hundred years of the colonies and the early republic no essential weakening, impairment and degeneracy of the family appear,''[4]

---

[4] Hagar, F. N., *The American Family;* quoted in Calhoun (following reference).

Calhoun very significantly points out that, "This period of relative stability is obviously the period reaching up to the beginnings of modern industrialism, with its consequent cityward drift."[5] It was only about the time of the Civil War that the Industrial Revolution made itself noticeably felt in this country and that our gigantic urban centers began to appear. And it is from that time that the disintegration of the American family has gone on with ever-increasing rapidity. The relation between the two movements is unmistakable. One would naturally expect the former stable social situation, normally, and even automatically, to have made for family unity and domestic stability. Domestic instability in an otherwise stable society, would, in other words, have been altogether unexpected. On the other hand, it is hardly to be wondered at that when the whole social organism seems out of gear, even that old and tried institution, the home, should fail to function smoothly. That it is in turmoil, no one would deny. Certain it is, too, that the disturbing change has developed simultaneously with the revolution in industry. In fact, it is altogether safe to say that, other things being equal, it has been affected in proportion to the extent of the industrial change. The least familial disorganization has taken place in the rural districts; the most, in urban parts. Much available evidence points to such a conclusion.

The fact remains, however, that even in very mobile urban districts much exemplary family life is to be found to-day. This must be attributed to other factors than mere pressure of circumstances, a social restraint that could more easily account for good family conditions in the open country or rural village. Despite weakness of the ties making for stability, many flourishing little home worlds are still found in urban centers. This is evidence that family stability does not always and of necessity follow general social instability, but rather that there exist other social forces and influences that can hold the home together, though undoubtedly with greater difficulty.

---

[5] Calhoun, A. W., *Social History of the American Family*, Vol. III, p. 165.

But the home has been affected, not only indirectly, that is, by a general ruffling of the social pattern. In many ways has the family unit also been directly affected. The hours of work away from the familial hearth, for instance, through the passing of industry out of the home to the mill, the shop, and the factory, and the driving of play out of the home through ever-increasing urban congestion, have combined to leave their mark upon family life. The changed position of women and their growing spirit of independence, rising out of new avenues of support opened to them and their subsequent economic emancipation, have also made their influence felt in the home. Again, there are the extremes of wealth and poverty, the changed standards of living, the pressure of economic forces upon the home, and the friction caused by economic change. These, too, have disturbed the home, while increasing community services have robbed it of many functions and thereby tended to weaken it. Many of these matters will be given more detailed attention in subsequent chapters.

IMMIGRATION

Reference has been made to immigrant colonies in this country and the integrating effects upon their families. But it is equally true, that immigration generally has proved a disturbing social factor. The great tides of immigration of the past century did much to make society, particularly in this country, mobile. Many people were, so to speak, transplanted from one cultural group to another. They were left thereby without the assistance of customs, traditions, habits, and controls that had formerly hedged them in and protected them. This change has affected not only individuals but also family groups. The immigrant family, coming in many instances out of a simple rural district of Europe into the heart of a complex American city, found the task of adjustment and adaptation not an easy one. The fact that these people in great part formed little communities of their own in our American cities, was of some help to them and to their family life. It did not, however, fit them into the general framework of American life.

Moreover, immigration is to-day still one of the root sources of familial disturbance. "The immigrant family, more perhaps than any other," writes Bruce Mohler,[6] "exists in varying stages of instability. This applies especially to those who are recently arrived. Oftentimes they consist of disorganized groups who find themselves at the various gateways to America. They have suddenly become separated from old established anchorages in their native countries, leaving behind all that was most precious, their old associates, their relatives, their friends, the homes which they and those who preceded them had learned to love and cherish, and above all, their priceless traditions without which life in a new country is bound to appear unharmonious and confusing. Even for those who come under the more favorable circumstances there is much that is bewildering and which demands prompt interpretation as to relative significance and value."

The same writer also points out that some federal laws actually operate to the detriment of many families. "Hundreds of cases of separation, desertion, concubinage, divorce and other forms of domestic tragedy are directly traceable to the operation of the United States immigration restriction laws in their incidence on certain countries, the quotas for which do not even suffice for the elementary requirements of the unification of wives and dependent children with their heads. The more one sees of these deplorable cases the more he feels how justified are those devotees who have for years advocated the policy of corrective legislation which would reserve places in the quotas for the service of dependent families."[7] He shows, further, the brutal effect of the retroactive deportation act upon many immigrant families and urges its repeal or amendment at the earliest possible moment.

---

[6] Mohler, B., "The Immigrant and the Family," *N.C.W.C. Review*, Jan., 1930, p. 25.

[7] *Ibid.*

Far-reaching too, and disturbing to the family, have been the many marriages between those of different racial cultures and of different social backgrounds. Dissimilarity tends to disintegrate the group no less than similarity helps to integrate it. The intermixture of many cultures brought about in this country by immigration has not been without notable disturbing effect upon familial and social life.

A Disorganized Community Complex.—The various root sources of social disturbance—immigration, the Industrial Revolution, rationalism, individualism, together with a large brood of offspring—are rapidly disorganizing the community complex. They are making for dissimilarity, for unlikeness of group members. Immigration is still playing a considerable part in the process. The Industrial Revolution is speedily bringing about a vast cultural change, a transition from agriculture to machinofacture. It is creating a species of applied-science super-civilization. The effect has been socially very disturbing. But the revolution in industry is not working alone. It has joined hands with other disorganizing factors. Through its media of communication it is promoting the rapid spread of the disintegrating, individualistic spirit. It is making more effective in practice both the separative principle of individualism and the doubting attitude of rationalism. By means of the radio, for instance, contrary and contradictory notions are broadcasted to the unthinking masses and to the very children in their homes. These ideas prevent or hamper the formation of a definite philosophy of life on the part of the individual. They promote mental and moral confusion. Again, the many and varied means of rapid transit have put the world on wheels. They have tremendously increased mobility. They are speedily breaking down the stability of the past. In turn they have given great impetus to the romantic spirit and to a hedonistic philosophy of life by bringing luxuries and comforts within the reach of many. A creed of softness has become very prevalent and is weakening the social fabric.

Singly and in unison these various root sources of change have carried on their disturbing and disintegrating work. They have greatly disorganized the community complex. They have robbed it of its community of cultural and intellectual interests, while, as a result, the affectional and emotional bonds have suffered. The cultural stability, the mental homogeneity, and the emotional harmony of the past have been affected. These have been supplanted by much unlikeness and dissimilarity. Society in general and the home in particular have been affected. And the end is not yet.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. Has the Industrial Revolution noticeably affected family integrity in your own community?
2. Mention the various functions that have been taken out of the home since the Industrial Revolution began.
3. Mention any special advantages for home life that the country town might have.
4. Does the housing condition in urban life harm the family?
5. Can you think of any further ways in which the Industrial Revolution has affected the home?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANDREWS, B. J., "Economic Aspects of the Modern Family," *The Family,* April, 1928.
BRUNO, F. J., "The Meaning of the Conference," *The Family,* Dec., 1927.
CALHOUN, A. W., *Social History of the American Family,* Vol. III.
ELIOT, F. M., "The New Neighborhood," *Survey Graphic,* Dec., 1927.
GROVES, E. R., and OGBURN, W. F., *American Marriage and Family Relationships,* Ch. II.
HINKLE, B. N., "Changing Marriage," *Survey Graphic,* Dec., 1926.
McDONALD, J. R., "The Christian Home," *Ecclesiastical Review,* Feb., 1927.
McGOWAN, R. A., "The Changing World and the Family," *N. C. W. C. Review,* Jan., 1930.
MOHLER, B., "The Immigrant and the Family," *N. C. W. C. Review,* Jan., 1930.
SCHMIEDELER, E., *The Industrial Revolution and the Home.*

CHAPTER VII

The Family and its Workers Affected

The modern family has been influenced not only as a part and parcel of the disturbed social organism, but it has been affected even more directly. Thus the root sources of social change indicated previously, have weakened the bonds that bound together the familial group. They have given rise to much internal strife in the domestic realm by creating disturbing situations. As a result increased family disorganization and disintegration exist. The purposes of the family have failed correspondingly, for the success of the family depends upon the degree of inherent integration.

The Industrial Family Bond.[1]—One of the family bonds that has been noticeably weakened in many a modern family is the industrial. Before the Industrial Revolution, as we have seen, industry was centered in and around the home. The situation served to interrelate the activities of the family members and to merge the interests into one harmonious whole. This situation made for a mutual dependence between the members and tended to bind them all together. Under the old circumstances, home-life rested upon an industrial basis that naturally made for unity. The family, as a consequence, was well able to fulfil its normal functions.

But with the revolution in industry came a change that affected family life adversely, a change that weakened this industrial bond of the family. Many of the traditional industries passed out of the home to mill, shop, and factory. The workshop was no longer an adjunct of the home. The man's business was no longer a family affair in which all members were occupied. Men, women, and children began to go outside the home for their occupations and interests. Perhaps no less striking than this industrial change was the resultant change in the domestic realm. Many and far-reaching have been the effects on the family and its members since the workers began following the industries out of the home. Yet, the change has not made its influence equally felt in all parts. Nor have its effects on the home been the same in extent.

---

[1] Schmiedeler, E., *The Industrial Revolution and the Home.*

Effect on the Rural Family Limited.—In the country, father, mother, and children, are to-day still occupied in and about the home or on the home place. Hence, there is still found, in great part, the industrial coöperation of earlier times. Yet, changes have come, and some that have not been without influence upon home-life. Excessive as the rural family's work hours may still seem, they have been shortened to some extent. The long and tiresome process of clothmaking, for instance, is no longer in the home. One would at any rate have to search rather diligently throughout the length and breadth of the land to find any backward and retarded frontier in which such occupations as spinning, weaving, fulling, carding, dyeing, and the like, are at all common. The new growth in industry, too, has brought some modern conveniences and time-saving devices into these homes. Modern farm implements have, to some extent, simplified the work in the fields. This has made work away from home for more adults possible, if not necessary. It has lessened the work of those who remain at home. Yet it has left the rural home largely an industrial unit.

And the same can generally be said of the economic factor. The rural home is commonly an economic unit to-day. Instead of receiving separate wages, as in the city, the family members generally help produce on the home place, and a common family fund rather than a separate wage is the rule. So, too, is the management of the home a shared activity of both parents. Some of the children may go to the city and receive a separate wage, but those who remain are an economic asset to the domestic group.

Hence, while there is a change in the family and its workers in the country, it is not a striking one compared with pre-Industrial Revolution days. Both the industrial and the economic bonds remain quite vigorous and firm. And the whole system of mutual industrial coöperation and economic interdependence still naturally serves to foster strong family feelings and love for the home. The affectional bond is cultivated; the familial group is integrated. Consequently, the training of children can still be carried on in the same informal and effective way as in the early agricultural times. In fact, with less time taken up with the physical activities of the home, those who remain in the country to-day can devote more attention to the real task of home-making, more time to the training of children, and to the enjoyment of the true values of home-life. The families, however, that go to the city, usually suffer considerable disorganization in the change.

The Urbanization Process.—While the Industrial Revolution has not appreciably affected the industrial and economic bonds of families who remain in the country, it has greatly modified many familial groups by driving them into the city—into more intimate contact with the maelstrom of modern industry. In 1880 the population was 71.4 per cent rural and 28.6 per cent urban. The fact that now over half of the people of this country live in communities exceeding 2500 suggests the extent to which the industrial factor has urbanized the United States. Family after family follows suit. Even of the families that remain in the country, grown children are more and more going city-ward, leaving behind them the protective care of home.

It is interesting to note how this process of urbanization goes on. The following incident which the writer recently witnessed in a country store in the West would seem clearly to show the process. A farmer brought a crate of eggs into the store, bought some groceries, and then asked for the balance in cash. He was somewhat taken aback when the merchant told him that he still owed $2.10 on the groceries he had bought. He berated the merchant bitterly about his high prices. The merchant took the matter coolly, and deliberately went over every item, pointing out several cans of peaches, different kinds of canned vegetables, some of Heinz's many varieties—all of the very best varieties he carried in the store. "But my bills never were so high in this store a short time ago," insisted the farmer. "Quite likely," replied the merchant, who was an enterprising business man and a recent arrival from a large city. "When I bought this store less than a year ago, not one of those varieties of canned goods you have there could be bought in this store. I brought them here. You people seem to want them. Of course, I must charge the price." The farmer's parting remark was: "It is so much easier on the women folks, but mighty hard on the pocketbook."

Many rural communities have for some time had such prepared goods close at hand. Many, too, have made use of them to a greater or lesser degree. Other communities, again, are in the transitional stage indicated by the incident above. There are rural districts, however, especially in the South and West, where such goods cannot so readily be obtained. Yet, more and more the means of communication, which the Industrial Revolution has given us, are connecting city and town with most distant rural parts. More and more the city is taking the raw materials from the farms and sending them back prepared for consumption. The process will go on. Will the women hold to the old system or will they embrace the new? How easy to convince themselves that they should make the change! Is not large scale production so much more economical? And then, the law gives reasonable assurance that the food is pure. Perhaps even the attractive cans and packages bring some pressure to bear. Why, then, swelter unnecessarily over a hot stove? Why bother with a garden?

It is difficult to stem a torrent, hard to make a stream flow backward, and yet, when the change is made, "It is mighty hard on the pocketbook." Will not at least Mary Jane have to leave the home circle and work to help keep it replenished? And so the urbanization process goes on.

Effect on the Urban Family Greater.—The industrial change has not only driven many individuals and even families to the city, it has also greatly modified home-life there. In that giant offspring of the Industrial Revolution, many of the traditional occupations of the home have become extra-domestic activities. The workers have largely left the home. Commonly they perform their tasks in entirely different environments. The father, for instance, may go to the packing house, the son to the garage, the daughter to the store or office. The tasks of the workers vary, and their business interests differ. The industrial coöperation of the rural home is missing. The family is no longer an industrial unit. The industrial bond and common industrial interests alike are gone.

The economic interdependence, too, is weaker in the city. The separate wage is the rule. Rearing a family is more a financial burden than in town or open country. The mutual interdependence and the similarity of interests that linked together the family members of an earlier day, and made for a potent home influence, is, in short, lacking. The industrial and economic bonds that formerly bound the family members are damaged, even broken. Not only does the family group more readily fall apart, but, even where it remains, it is hampered in its normal functions.

The Father and Child in the City.—The fact that the burden of supporting the family first of all rests upon the father is evident, and there is no need of laboring the point that in the modern city the work of men generally, both married and unmarried, is away from home regardless of whether they be captains of industry or poor employees. They are absent from the home hearth throughout the day. Thus, the father's prestige in the home and his influence over the children wanes. The personal contact between parent and child, so essential for effective training of the latter, is missing.

In this connection the question of a short work-day takes on much meaning. In the case of some families at least, it enables the father, mother, and children to be together for the morning and evening meals and to spend together the evenings, in addition to the Sundays. That provides some opportunity for the paternal influence so necessary for the child. The ideas acquired outside the home can be interpreted within the family circle, furthermore, both parents thus have a hand in shaping the lives of their children. But when a father must work ten hours and more at heavy tasks, and at times even at night and on Sundays, then we have a situation that reduces his influence in the home to a minimum. Nor can he himself enjoy the comforts and pleasures of normal home-life. Yet such is actually the case with only too many in our modern industrial city.

No doubt the Industrial Revolution has likewise greatly affected the status of woman. Some of the results have been beneficial to her. It is readily apparent, on the other hand, that many of the effects have been detrimental both to woman herself and to the functions and purposes of the family. Detailed attention will be given to this matter in the next chapter.

Child Labor.—It will undoubtedly be conceded that in the case of urban families the children have not so many tasks to occupy them as have the children on the farm. In consequence, there is not the chance for informal training in connection with work that is so general in the rural home. The industrial training normally given the child at home in the past, can no longer be given there. The technical training so often necessary to-day, too, is quite impossible. Necessary as the vocational guidance movement is to care for this situation, it nevertheless marks the passing of another function from the hearth and a further decrease in the home's prestige. The growth of the whole school system has also largely removed mental training from the home and thus weakened the educational bond, so influential in the home of an earlier day.

Children, furthermore, are usually more of a liability in the city than they are in the country home. In some poorer families, at least, they become so to such an extent, that they must seek remunerative work outside the home. Naturally for these the fairly constant influence of home-life is an impossibility. Such children are, for the greater part of the time, beyond the reach of parental sway. Home for them can mean little more than a place to sleep and eat. Often, too, poverty in such a home makes normal family life impossible, and family recreation is out of the question because of the fatigue of the child-worker. Under such circumstances moral training becomes extremely difficult. Evidence shows that the child-worker's environment and lack of parental influence jeopardizes not only his moral training but also his physical, mental and manual training.

Safeguarding the proper physical development of the child is also a function of the home. This is undoubtedly a more serious task in the case of the child-worker in the city than in the case of the child on the farm. There is lacking the boon of fresh air and sunshine. Nor will the average employers have the same concern about the child-worker's health as have the parents. The work itself as found in the city is ordinarily more dangerous.

First of all, there is the liability of children to accidents. One investigation, for instance, showed that boys under 16 had suffered twice as many accidents as the adults; and girls under 16, three times as many accidents as women.[2] Even among adults the accident rate is appallingly high.

Experience, too, has shown that children are very susceptible to occupational diseases. The morbidity rate is higher among child-workers than among non-workers. An incomplete development of the muscular and nervous system means that the child has only a minimum power of resistance to the poisonous substance and injurious dusts to which it is exposed in many industries. Austrian morbidity insurance records, for example, show an extremely high invalidity rate among youthful workers. The rate becomes alarming especially during the second year of working life, when the injurious effects of the occupation have had time to show themselves.[3]

---

[2] U. S. Industrial Commission, Final Report, pp. 917–918.

The mortality rate also is higher among working children than among the non-working. A study of the causes of death among cotton-mill workers in Fall River, Massachusettts, showed that the death rate from tuberculosis among boys fifteen to nineteen years of age employed in the cotton mills was nearly double that of boys not so employed. An even greater difference was found in the case of the girls of the same age.[4]

But the revolution in industry, by taking the work of the child out of the home, has created not only the problem of child-labor but also the far more extensive problem of child-idleness. This will receive due consideration in the treatment of the use of leisure time.

Insufficient Income and the Family.—The wage system is another offshoot of our machinofacture culture. The individual is absolutely dependent for his living upon the wage that he draws. Only too frequently to-day is the income of the head of the home insufficient for the family. As a result, there is that new and startling phenomenon of our industrialism—the dependent family. "Those who come in contact with poor families are familiar with the family of four or five or more children whose chief bread-winner earns from $900 to $1,000 a year. Even with the most careful management, such a family cannot secure the essentials of life: food, clothing, and shelter. The results are easily discernible in the poor health and weakened vitality of both parents and children. If the family has any standards of respectability, it will make every effort to keep up outward appearances while sacrificing some of the essentials in food and fuel.''[5] These underfed, under-clothed, and under-housed families do not necessarily disintegrate, but they are very much hampered in performing their normal and expected functions. Theirs cannot be a very satisfying family life.

---

[3] U. S. Children's Bureau, Publication 93, p. 26.

[4] *Summary of the Report on the Condition of Women and Child Wage Earners in the U. S.*, p. 368.

Actual Wages and Minimum Standards of Living.—In recent years there have been made a number of careful studies of wage conditions and also of the actual amount necessary to maintain a family of five, consisting of a father, mother, and three children under fourteen, in health and decency. When we compare the actual wages received with the minimum standards necessary, we find that, very commonly, the former do not measure up to the latter. Thus, the cost of living survey made by the United States Bureau of Labor in 1918–1919, covering more than 12,000 families of wage-earners and small-salaried men in 92 cities and towns, showed average earnings of $1,349 per family. Of the 12,096 families, 332, or 2.74 per cent, had incomes of less than $900 a year; 2,423 ranged between $900 and 1,200; 3,959 between $1,200 and $1,500; 2,730, between $1,500 and $1,800; 1,594, between $1,800 and $2,100.[6]

In 1923 the National Industrial Conference Board found the average week's earning of 129,000 unskilled male wage earners in 23 major manufacturing industries to be $23.14, at which rate 50 weeks' work would yield $1,157. For 393,000 skilled workers the average was $30.90 a week, at which rate 50 weeks would amount to $1,545. Statistics gathered by other organizations showed similar situations. Finally, for January, 1928, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics reported the average entrance rate of 121,000 men doing common labor in 13 important industries in parts of the country to be 43 cents an hour, at which rate a 50-hour week for 50 weeks of the year would yield $1,075. Estimates of amounts necessary for the maintenance of fair and reasonable standards of living, on the other hand, very generally run between $1,500 and $2,000, varying somewhat according to particular localities.

---

[5] O'Grady, J., *An Introduction to Social Work*, p. 217.

[6] Douglas, P. H., "Wages and Hours of Labor in 1919," *Journal of Political Economy*, Jan. 1921.

Other Disabilities of Wage-Earners and Their Families.—Even the workman who is receiving what is commonly considered a living wage, frequently finds it difficult to make ends meet. There are, for instance, the extraordinary expenses incident to childbirth. Again, all income may be cut off, temporarily or permanently, through unemployment, sickness, accident or old age. Commonly it is one of these disabilities that bring a family for the first time to the attention of social agencies.

Of these serious features of man's changed industrial position affecting many families adversely, special mention may well be made of unemployment. It is very extensive, and seemingly increasing. Because of it, masses of workers are not assured reasonable security of employment under the modern competitive industrialism that we have so confidently organized. And many a home suffers as a consequence.

When the ordinary wage-earner of to-day is out of work he becomes quite helpless, and he can do little or nothing to maintain either himself or his family. During times of prosperity employers can often build up reserve funds to meet the emergencies incident to price recession, but the average wage-earner's income is not sufficient to enable him to provide a financial reserve against unemployment. The meager savings accumulated are soon exhausted when unemployment or part-time employment affects his regular source of income. This condition threatens the integrity of the home, threatens alike the foundations of new homes and the maintenance of those already established.

Specific evil effects of unemployment, both upon individuals and family life, are indicated in a study made by the Children's Bureau during the industrial depression of 1921.[7] The fields of study were selected to represent as nearly as possible a cross-section of unemployed men who had families in which there were two or more children under eighteen years of age. The evidence shows that, prior to the period of depression, the families were able to make payments on homes and to save, besides being able to enjoy a comfortable living. With the coming of the period of unemployment—more than two-thirds of the fathers included had been out of work for over a year—the family savings were exhausted and great changes took place in the homes. In Racine, 29 per cent of the mothers in the families of the unemployed men, and in Springfield, 37 per cent were employed. Of these 116 working mothers, 90 had apparently begun work as a result of the father's unemployment. The remaining 26 had been engaged in gainful work before. Three-fourths of all the working mothers were employed away from home.[8] Naturally the situation in these homes did not ideally solve the question of child care and training.

Children also worked during the period of the father's unemployment. "Of the 148 children 14 to 17 years of age, inclusive, in the 366 families included in the study, 45 had been regularly employed at some time during the father's unemployment. . . . In addition to 45 children—in 41 families—who were regularly employed, there were 42 children—in 34 families—who made some contribution towards the family's support by working after school, on Saturday, or during vacations."[9]

Another result of unemployment, altogether to be expected, is the lowered standard of living in the workingmen's homes. This matter was given attention in the study of the Children's Bureau referred to. It was found that for their maintenance during unemployment, half of the families, for which there was complete information, averaged one-half as much as they did while the father was working. Being skilled workers, the fathers' wages had been fair, more than nine-tenths of them earning between $100 and $175 a month. During the period of unemployment the family resources fell to between $25 and $100 per month. This included all resources of income; the father's income from temporary work that he could secure, the wages of the mother and children, the savings that were taken from the bank, and the loans that were made, the food and other necessities purchased on credit, and aid from relatives and from public and private relief agencies.[10]

---

[7] U. S. Children's Bureau, Publication 125.
[8] Ibid, p. 46.
[9] Ibid, p. 57.

"It is inevitable," says the report, "that there should be a lowering of the standards of family life when the regular income is interrupted. Frugality in food, even to the point of actual privation, a dangerous saving of fuel, economy in clothing and household supplies, reduction of the housing cost through seeking cheaper quarters or crowding the family to secure an income from lodgers, always follow the bread-winner's loss of work, even though the family does not actually have to seek outside sources of aid. When the father loses his job the mother must secure work if it is possible for her to do so. Approximately one-third of the children included in the study were in families in which the mother did undertake and was engaged in gainful employment either within or outside the home. The evidence indicates that in some of these families the money for the family's food was secured at the cost of permanent injury to the health of the mother and neglect of the children."[11]

Besides the immediate privation and hardship, the investigation showed as resulting a burden of debt and discouragement for years to come. In many cases the savings of years were exhausted, homes paid for in whole or in part were lost, and debts accumulated. Over four-fifths of the families were in debt for food and other necessities. With it all, there is naturally a sense of fear and uneasiness among the members while the main breadwinner is out of work. The whole situation tends to demoralize the family and its members. ''The most important feature of unemployment,'' says the report, ''is its effect on the family morale—the father idle about the house, unsettled, disheartened; the mother going out to work if she can secure it, and using up every bit of strength in the double task of providing for the household and children; the children suffering from depression and uncertainty of what the future may mean, which is even more to be dreaded than the discomforts of the immediate present.''[12] There is no questioning the fact that a lowering of the standard of living takes place in such a situation, nor that a deterioration of individuals and homes is apt to follow. This is especially brought out in a number of cases given in detail by the study.

---

[10] Ibid, pp. 1–2.
[11] Ibid, p. 3.

The remarks of housewives, noted in a recent study of a typical American community, suggests the uncertainty and worry to home-makers arising from unemployment. The following are samples: ''I know people that have been out of work since June, and they're almost crazy.'' ''We lost both our home and our auto.'' ''We have cut down all we can in food, and the 'phone is the next thing to go. He hates to see the 'phone go. It's the only way we hear from the children.'' ''We had been saving to buy a home but lost all our savings paying rent when he was laid off.''[13]

Such descriptions could easily be multiplied. And there is this unfortunate circumstance that unemployment is not confined to mere periods of depression. It is found in this country to a very considerable extent even in normal times. Apparently, too, it is now steadily increasing. Formerly, the invention of a new machine meant only temporary unemployment, for eventually conditions adjusted themselves, new jobs were created by the demand of tending and servicing the machines, or in finding markets for the manufactured wares. But what is to-day known as ''technological unemployment,'' involves an ever-growing army of unemployed. More workers are displaced than are reabsorbed into other occupations. ''The supply of new jobs has not been equal to the number of new workers plus the old workers displaced. Hence there has been a net increase of unemployment between 1920 and 1927, which exceeds 650,000 people.''[14] Such a trend is an unhealthy one and bodes no good for the family.

---

[12] Ibid.

[13] Lynd, R. and H., *Middletown;* quoted in Stuart Chase's *Prosperity Fact or Myth,* p. 157.

Besides unemployment with its sense of insecurity and at times utter demoralization of the home, there are other similar by-products of our modern industrialism that have affected many a home adversely. There is, for instance, unsteadiness of employment or labor turnover, a problem much akin to unemployment. Excessive labor mobility tends gradually to lead to idleness, and this, in turn, to economic insufficiency, forcing the victim to rely upon charitable sources of maintenance or to adopt anti-social or even vicious methods of support. Certainly the situation is not a healthy one for family life.

Then there are the migratory workers, with their tramp life, making real family life quite impossible—another offshoot of the Industrial Revolution. A large part of these workers degenerate economically and socially, eventually becoming ''down-and-outs.'' Merely to mention another such phase of the changed industrial situation, there is the ever-increasing number of traveling salesmen, railroad employees, and the like, with their haphazard family association. To say the least, their home-life often differs vastly from that of the American homesteaders largely ''attached to the soil'' in pre-Industrial Revolution days.

Such is, at least, a brief and partial glimpse of the home as affected by the change in the family and its workers. While rural parts have not remained altogether unaffected by these changes, certainly by far the most far-reaching results appear in the capital of the Industrial Revolution, the modern industrial city. There, especially, has it weakened familial ties and hampered the home in the satisfactory performance of its traditional functions of rearing and training children.

---

[14] Mitchell, W. C., "Recent Economic Changes"; quoted in Stuart Chase's *Prosperity Fact or Myth*, p. 157

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. Does poverty cause bad home life or does bad home life cause poverty?
2. Are the evils of our industrial system affecting home life generally throughout the Western World?
3. Do you know of any instances in your own community in which work is still largely on a family basis?
4. Do hard economic circumstances hinder or help the development of family affection?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALEXANDER, M. W., "Hiring and Firing," *Annals of the American Academy of Political Science,* Vol. LXV, pp. 130–44.
BOSANQUET, H., *The Family,* Chs. VIII, IX.
GROVES, E. R., *The Drifting Home.*
————, *Social Problems and Education,* Ch. V.
MITCHELL, M. C., *Recent Economic Changes.*
MUSTE, A. J., "The Tug of Industry," *Survey Graphic,* Dec., 1927.
O'GRADY, J., *An Introduction to Social Work,* Chs. XI, XII.
SCHMIEDELER, E., *The Industrial Revolution and the Home,* Ch. I.
SPENSER, A. G., *The Family and Its Members,* Ch. XIII.
U. S. Industrial Commission, Final Report.
U. S. Children's Bureau, Publication, No. 125, p. 93.

CHAPTER VIII

WOMEN WORKERS AND THE FAMILY

A change of great importance to the family resulting from the transition from agriculture to machinofacture is the fact that many women have come to work away from home. If the father's income proves insufficient, other members of the family must leave the home for work. Married women, even mothers, are doing so in large numbers today. This warps family life. Then there are the mothers of the future, the unmarried daughters of the present. They are breadwinners outside the home in even greater and in ever-increasing numbers. This is a different situation from earlier rural times. It affects their preparation for marriage and for family life. In various ways the family suffers because of this phenomenon of modern industrialism, the gainful employment of women in industry.

The Extent of Woman's Employment.—In order to make any kind of accurate estimate of the extent to which women generally and home life have been affected by the new industry, it will first of all be necessary to have some idea of the number actually employed and to be familiar with some of the details of their industrial status. An extensive study of the position of women in industry was made by the Women's Bureau and published in 1925. Four localities were made the subject of this study: Jacksonville, Florida; Wilkes-Barre and the adjacent Hanover Township in Pennsylvania; Butte, Montana; and Passaic, New Jersey. As noted in the report, these cities were selected to secure a wide range in regional and local influences. Thus, Jacksonville, Florida, is a port city, this fact having a very direct effect upon the employment opportunities of Jacksonville women who need or desire gainful employment opportunities. Wilkes-Barre and Hanover Township, together embracing a population of coal regions of Pennsylvania, are places of diversified industries. In Butte, Montana, mining is dominant. There is little industrial or commercial activity not connected with mining operations. The Passaic industries are conspicuous as employers of women. This, then, should give a more or less representative picture of the country as a whole, in the matter of family status of bread-winning women in the United States.

The proportion of women gainfully employed, the bulletin points out, did not rise or fall in any discernible degree because of the presence of so-called women-employing industries. Many women in every city or town must earn a living, not only for themselves but frequently for dependents, and they must take up the employment that is available.[1]

This 4-city study brought out the fact that in Butte and Wilkes-Barre, with Hanover Township, slightly less than 30 per cent of the female population of 14 years and over, were gainfully employed, and in Jacksonville and Passaic approximately 45 and 46 per cent respectively. The aggregate number for the four cities was approximately 40,000 (38,446), which constituted 38 per cent of the total female population of 14 years and over.[2]

As the number of women workers varies some in cities, so does it vary also by States in different parts of the country. Thus in 1920 South Carolina ranked highest with 33.4 per cent of its women of ten years of age and over gainfully employed. Rhode Island was next with 32.7 per cent. The lowest percentage, 11.2 was found in West Virginia. Idaho followed with 12.0 per cent. Five other States had less than 14.0 per cent gainfully employed, Kansas, for example, having 13.7 per cent.[3]

---

[1] U. S. Women's Bureau, Publication 41, pp 2–4.
[2] Ibid, p. 7.
[3] U. S. Women's Bureau, Publication 46, p. 11.

The total number of women gainfully employed in the United States was 8,549,511 according to the 1920 census. Since that time the number apparently has been increasing.

The Number of Married and Single Women Workers.—Of the above 1920 census figure, 6,425,515 of the women workers were listed as single, widowed, divorced or unknown; 1,920,281 as married.

Of the aggregate number of women workers of the 4-city study, 55 per cent were bread-winning matrons, that is, women who were or had been married. Nor were these breadwinners chiefly childless women, for the data show that 53 per cent had children, 49 per cent having babies under five years of age.[4]

In 1890, less than five out of every hundred married women were gainfully employed. In 1920, nine out of every hundred married women were gainfully employed. In other words, one out of every twenty-two married women was gainfully employed in 1890; in 1920, one out of every eleven. The total number of women employed in industry has increased 7 per cent since 1910; the number of married women has increased 43 per cent.[5]

Working Within and Outside the Home.—Another socially significant distinction, especially as far as the family is concerned, indicated in the 4-city report, is the number of women gainfully employed within the home and the number working outside the domestic domain. Over two-thirds of the entire number of bread-winning women in the four cities worked outside the home. Almost two-fifths of the mothers with children under five years of age, 37 per cent were working outside the home for monetary considerations.[6]

The women who performed gainful work in their own homes constituted 31 per cent of all the breadwinning women included in the study. In Wilkes-Barre and Hanover Township, and in Passaic, the great majority were engaged in the business of taking in boarders and lodgers. Among the white women of Jacksonville this was also the most common gainful occupation, while among the negro women, ''taking in washing'' was the chief means of making money. In these three cities, 5,228 women breadwinners took in approximately 13,000 boarders and lodgers as a supplemental source of income.[7]

---

[4] U. S. Women's Bureau, Publication 41, p. 10.
[5] U. S. Women's Bureau, Publication 38, p. 21.
[6] U. S. Women's Bureau, Publication 41, p. 11.

Incidentally, the report also shows that, commonly, the breadwinning matrons were at the same time home-makers. The resemblance of the proportions for the several cities in this respect is very striking. Jacksonville and Butte revealed about 77 per cent, or a little less than four-fifths, while the other two cities showed a little over four-fifths enacting the double role of breadwinner and homemaker.[8]

The length of the work day for these workers is also of some significance as far as the individual and the home is concerned. Of the 13 states studied in this regard by the Women's Bureau, Rhode Island showed the most satisfactory record, with 68.2 of the women gainfully employed, working only 48 hours or less a week. At the other extreme we find Georgia with 1.5 per cent working 48 hours and under per week, and 98.5 per cent working over 48 hours.[9]

Living at Home or Away.—The 4-city study showed that in the case of the single women-breadwinners, approximately three-fifths were living under the parental roof. The remainder were boarding or lodging with relatives or employers, or in institutions. They were simply ''adrift.''[10]

As might well be expected, single women-workers from the rural districts live away from home more than is the case with the urban. This is evidenced by a study based on the findings of the United States Coal Commission. Three-fourths of the bituminous mine workers were living in places classed as rural, while less than one-third of the anthracite group were so classed. As a consequence, the women in the anthracite group had more extensive and varied opportunities for employment. ''A significant consequence,'' says the report, ''of these differences in employment open to young women members of mine workers' families is discernible in the proportion of families in the two regions having daughters when the daughters were counted irrespective of age, the proportion of anthracite families personally visited having daughters 15 years of age and over within the family circle (28.5 per cent) was almost half as much again as the proportion of bituminous families having daughters so classified (19.5 per cent). These facts clearly indicate the earlier departure from home of the daughters in bituminous mine regions, as the ages of mine workers themselves do not differ materially in the two fields and the smaller proportion of adult daughters in the bituminous fields is not chargeable to a larger number of younger parents.[11]

---

[7] U. S. Women's Bureau, Publication 41, pp. 11–12.
[8] Ibid., p . 10.
[9] U. S. Women's Bureau, Publication 46, p. 49.
[10] U. S. Women's Bureau, Publication 41, p. 13.

SOME EFFECTS OF THE CHANGED SITUATION

The entrance of women into industries outside the home that resulted from the Industrial Revolution has had many effects that are none too beneficial to the workers themselves, to children in the homes and to family groups. Even in cases in which the family may have suffered no notable disorganization, it is frequently hampered in its chief purposes and functions.

The Single Women-Breadwinners.—While the homes of the present depend so much upon the mothers, those of the future will depend upon the grown daughters of to-day. We have seen that the latter are breadwinners in ever-increasing numbers. As noted, many of those that work away from home also live away from their families. Normally one would expect the most far-reaching consequences in the case of these breadwinners who not only work away from home but also live outside the domestic circle. Such no longer have the protection of family life or the sense of security and stability that attaches to home environment.

---

[11] U. S. Women's Bureau, Publication 45, p. 14.

Nor is there the same economic bond binding the workers to the family in the case of those who are away, as in the case of those who remain in the home circle. The former are economically more "adrift." Whether their earnings are needed in the support of the family or not, they must use a considerable part for shelter and other necessities.

And there is the important question whether those "adrift" and altogther separated from home influences, will be prepared for family and home-life in case they marry. There can be little question that girls who leave school early and are engaged in extra-domestic work all day and every day, do not get adequate training in home-making. In more rural times such training was ordinarily received in the home. Lack of this training may lead to considerable domestic unhappiness. It may even disintegrate a home.

Again, the woman of pre-Industrial Revolution days was almost compelled to marry for support. Spinsterhood was feared and the lot of "bachelor maids" was not an enviable one. To-day, however, woman can refuse marriage much more readily. With the attainment of economic independence she is no longer under so great a moral compulsion to marry. She has attained an ethical right; the right to choose freely a calling aside from that of marriage or the convent.

With an independent income of her own, or the easily accessible opportunity of obtaining one, she is in a quite different condition. Marriage for her is much more a matter of choice than it was for her sister of former times, since as a vocation it has increasingly come into competition with diversified profitable occupations. Some women postpone marriage, hesitating to give up a good salary. There is also some evidence to suggest that fewer of these eventually marry. And in recent years the young girl who does marry is freer about going back into industry without the opposition of her husband or friends than was formerly the case. Her new opportunities, too, have in some cases turned the head of woman and caused her to look upon home-making as commonplace and menial, as something akin to Egyptian bondage. Such attitudes naturally prove very detrimental to satisfying home life.

Finally, now that woman's desire for economic security has become less significant, the motive of love can more readily enter into marriage and home-making. In itself this is beyond doubt a good thing. In point of fact, however, it has led to no inconsiderable amount of harm. Some women have not only supplanted the desire for security by a desire for response as a prime motive in the selection of a husband, but they have also made the permanence of the marriage relation depend upon the continuance of an affectional basis that at times falls quite short of true spiritual love. Self-satisfaction and the wishes of the individual are placed by such above the true conception of marriage. The whole situation has led in some instances to an exaggerated individualization of behavior in marriage, and to mere experiments in marriage relations, that have made for anything but family integration.

A New Code of Sexual Morality.—There is also some connection between the new situation of women in industry and the new sex code—or codeless sex—with which the world is experimenting. Certainly the general decline in the sexual morality and ideals of men and women so much in evidence in more recent years is due in part, as R. A. McGowan says, to the economic frame in which men and women live. "When one out of five of the gainfully employed are women, and when working women are one out of five women of the country, then we have a set of circumstances that causes a complete change in the temptations of sexual immorality.

"Since many women work as men work and, like men, make their living for themselves, they are tempted to act as men act and live as men live. To this, add proximity at work and often confidential relations. Add the delay in marrying. Add the lonesomeness of many working women and their unjustly frustrated desire to marry and rear children. Add the fact that companionship at work leads to social relationships and that it is at work or going to and from work that many men and women strike up those acquaintanceships which may or may not lead to marriage. Add the type of recreation that will match the pace of the machine and the rush of the industrial and commercial city. Add the show of wealth in our wealthy age. Add the influence of industry upon divorce and the calm acceptance now of birth-control. Add the realization that, after all, it is their employers and the machines they work with that control much of their life and that they have somehow partially lost control of themselves. In some cases, add extreme poverty.

"The result is a new thing in the lives of countless women. Some change their ideas of right and wrong. Some stand confused. Some become weak of will. Some grow cynical. Some skate on thin ice in search of recreation. The general effect over society as a whole is a change of sexual codes of conduct, though here again as always in such matters it is a question of general results and not results in individual cases and an influence outside the ranks of the working people greater often than within the ranks."[12] It is needless to comment that there is the closest relationship between any change in sex codes and family life.

Other factors besides industry, it is true, have also had a share in this development. By no means was it entirely brought about by the change that took woman out of the home to work. There is, for instance, the lack of religious influence, the recent demoralizing war, the theatre, the magazine, the current fiction, the ball-room, the night-clubs, and the automobile—all both cause and at the same time give evidence of an ever-increasing disregard for the rudiments of decency in deportment, conventions, and conduct.

---

[12] McGowan, R. A., "Women in Industry" (*N.C.W.C. Publication*), pp. 32–33.

Working Mothers and the Family. We have seen that approximately 2,000,000 married women are found in the army of American workers. A large per cent of these, moreover, are mothers of young children. Some of them work outside the home; others work for monetary considerations within the domestic realm. The reactions upon family life naturally are more readily harmful in the case of married than of unmarried workers. Even in the cases in which mothers become breadwinners within the home, as do those, for instance, who take in boarders or lodgers, the effect is quite detrimental to home life and to the main purposes of the family. It often involves a considerable infringement upon the privacy of home life. And here, as in the case of work outside the home, there is frequently overwork and resultant nervous strain upon the mother.

More particularly, however, it is the employment of mothers outside the home that is injurious to the family spirit and life. Many women heroically bear the strain of double duties, namely, those within and those without the home, and do so with truly remarkable efficiency. Yet, in spite of all their heroic effort, family life frequently does not go unscathed.

The prime purpose of the family is affected, first of all, by a lessening of the birth-rate. Thus, a very careful English Report[13] on the fertility of marriage shows that the employment of women, as a rule, lowers the birth rate. According to the investigation, the birth-rate among women clerks, for instance, is only 55 per cent of the average, while married professional workers are near the bottom of the list. No such nation-wide investigation has been made in this country, but the material on hand from a number of local studies points to the same conclusion. There is also undoubtedly some relation between birth-control and women in industry. The fact that so many women work is a direct temptation to practice birth-control. Married women are led into the practice by the desire to retain their position and income. In the case of the poor, proposals for restricting families are often brought forth on grounds of compassion. The industrial factor, however, is only one of the causes at the bottom of this movement.

---

[13] *Report on the Fertility of Marriage,* Vol. XIII of the 1911 Census of England and Wales.

The Children of Working Mothers.—Not only does the new industrial status of women tend to lessen the birth-rate, but it also affects the nurture and culture of the children that are born. In various ways it interferes with the performance of this basic function of the family, the rearing of children. The wife wage-earner is contributing to family income in perhaps one-fourth of the urban low-income groups, and in one-fifth of all families in large cities. Many of these women have children, and it is in the case of these mothers of children that we see the vital effects of women in industry. A careful study made in Passaic, New Jersey,[14] shows the amount and kind of care commonly given to children of working mothers. The main results of the study are summarized as follows:

> (1) Over one-fifth of the mothers worked at night, giving the children at least some care during the day.
> (2) Nearly one-fifth of the mothers left the children with neighbors, landladies, or boarders.
> (3) Another fifth left children with mother's or father's relatives, about one-fourth such relatives living outside the home.
> (4) Over one-tenth of the mothers going out to work left the children at home to the care of husbands who were night workers, unemployed, or working at home.
> (5) More than one-fifth left children virtually without care in the home. Eighty-two of these mothers, having children of school age, were assured that the children were safe for part of the working day at least; the others had children below school age—some under five—who had no care at all or only such as children 14 years of age and under could give.
> (6) Twenty-five out of 522 left children in the care of paid custodians.

---

[14] U. S. Women's Bureau, Publication 23, p. 7.

The situation is undoubtedly quite typical of families in which the mother works away from home. It is readily apparent from the report that the care, in many cases at least, was rather casual and quite inadequate, even as far as ordinary physical care and protection of the child is concerned. Consequently, it is not surprising, for instance, to find that the mortality-rate of children whose mothers are gainfully employed runs exceptionally high.

Mortality-Rate of Children of Working Mothers.—The children of working mothers die at a faster rate than the children who have a mother's constant care. In its study, for instance, in Manchester, New Hampshire, in 1917, the U. S. Children's Bureau found that: "Babies of mothers gainfully employed during the year preceding the baby's birth had a mortality-rate of 192.2 per thousand, whereas the rate for babies whose mothers worked away from home was 227.5.[15]

In fact, an excess in the mortality-rate of infants whose mothers were gainfully employed in the year preceding the child's birth was found in every city investigated by the Children's Bureau except one. Eight studies had been made in different parts of the country in an effort to determine the influence of economic conditions on the death rate of children. So, too, is the fact brought out in the Bureau's booklet, "Casual Factors in Infant Mortality," that, in general, there are more deaths of infants for working mothers than for the unemployed. Thus, in the eight cities studied, the death rate of infants when mothers were gainfully employed at home was 114.6 per thousand and 176.1 for those whose mothers worked away from home, and 98 when the mother was not gainfully employed. When the mother worked out of the home during the first year of the child's life, the child had a little more than half the average chance to live.

Of course, one may very rightly conclude that the death-rate of these children is high, not merely because of their mothers' work, but because of the maternal neglect and the mother's inefficient housekeeping and low standards that are a necessary part of the whole situation. Usually in households where the mother goes out to work, there are also such additional evils as poverty, poor nutrition, ignorance of child-care, and the like, from which the mother's absence from the home as a casual factor in child mortality can not be altogether dissociated.

---

[15] U. S. Children's Bureau, Publication 20, p. 51.

Other Adverse Effects on Children.—Even of the children that live, some grow up undernourished, physically weak, and with little power to resist disease. Frequently this goes back to the physical conditions of the mother before birth. Long hours and the strain of double duties often hurt the health of the mother, and that, in turn, undermines the health of the children.

Frequently, also, does the double task placed upon her make the mother irritable and cross. This tends to lead to clashes and friction within the home circle and to unfit the mother for her task of rearing the children. The socialization of the children is also hampered because the necessary contact for normal upbringing is utterly impossible when the mother is out of the home the greater part of the day. The children lack the training of mind and heart which a mother's care should give them. Records of child-caring agencies are replete with examples that show that children of working mothers suffer very seriously from lack of proper parental supervision.

And that is only what can be expected since, normally, the whole training of the child, particularly in the earliest years, is carried on through contact between mother and child in the home. It is to be expected, therefore, that when work takes the mother out of the home, entirely separating mother and child throughout the day, the training of the latter suffers. In order that children may be brought up fully prepared to shoulder a fair share of life's responsibilities and to fit into our complex societal life, due supervision and guidance on the part of the parents is essential. No substitute can take the place of an intelligent mother. Hence, children of working mothers suffer a serious loss through lack of maternal contact. It is unfortunate indeed that a large number of mothers are gainfully employed and consequently have little time and opportunity for home-making and for proper care of their offspring. Mothers in industry means much harm to the prime purpose of the family.

Wives Who Do Not Work.—While there are some women that are veritable drudges within the home, and while others are to be found who valiantly shoulder the double task of work within and outside the home, there are also those who do very little, if any, work at all. The latter are frequently spoiled by leisure time which they cannot or do not use with profit. The ultimate upshot of the situation is a considerable amount of harm to many of their number, to their families, and to others. Such women are found particularly among the well-to-do. Yet a certain number can also be found in other classes of society. Relieved of many responsibilities of housekeeping by living in family hotels or apartments or, again, by shirking the task of rearing a family, these parasitic wives referred to by some as the ‘‘decorative class,’’ spend their time in personal pleasures and selfish amusements. Devoid of the sense of social responsibility and of the wholesome values of life, they run after empty pleasures that only too frequently leave them wearied and unsatisfied. Left without the disciplinary value of a normal amount of necessary and absorbing labor, they lack that steadying ballast which goes with a sense of being of some use in the world. They are without worthwhile interests in life and, consequently, are restless and discontented. With their hearts and interests in out-of-home activities, instead of within their homes, they spend their time in ever seeking new and varying stimulations. They never acquire a domestic spirit. Their homes ever remain soulless. Moreover, family friction and instability may readily result. And only too frequently does their leisure time lead such parasitic wives away from, rather than to, their husbands as well as their homes.

Unfortunately the evil does not stop with these individuals and their families. In many instances these restless misfits are a source of disturbance to the masses of women who are happily and contentedly absorbed in their home interests and who are busy making themselves useful to their families and to society.

Thus, in various ways, has the status of modern woman been changed, particularly, in more recent decades. One of the fundamental factors in the change was the Industrial Revolution. The reactions upon family life have, to no small extent, been unfortunate.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. How does the gainful employment of women within the home affect family life?
2. Which is the greater evil, mothers in industry or parasitic wives?
3. Do the experiences of the wage-earning woman alienate her from marriage and the home?
4. How many women are gainfully employed in your State?
5. Have any cases come under your observation in which the economic independence of women proved detrimental?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbot, E., *Women in Industry.*
Bosanquet, H., *The Family,* Ch. IX.
Fletcher, M., *The Christian Family,* Ch. X.
Groves, E. R., and Ogburn, W. F., *American Marriage and Family Relationships,* Chs. IV, V.
Hughes, G. S., *Mothers in Industry.*
McGowan, R. A., "Women in Industry" (*N. C. W. C. Publication,* Washington, D. C.)
Parsons, E. C., *The Family,* Ch. X.
Pruette, L., *Women and Leisure.*
Schmiedeler, E., *The Industrial Revolution and the Home,* Ch. I.
Snedden, D., *Probable Economic Future of Women, Amer. Journal of Soc.,* Vol. XXIV, No. 5.
Survey Graphic, Dec., 1926.
U. S. Women's Bureau, "Facts About Working Women," Publication No. 46.
——————, "Family Status of Breadwinning Women," Publication No. 23.

——————, "Family Status of Breadwinning Women in Four Selected Cities," Publication No. 41.
——————, "Home Environment and Employment Opportunities of Women in Coal Mine Workers' Families," Publication No. 45.
——————, "Married Women in Industry," Publication No. 38.

CHAPTER IX

THE MODERN HOME AND LEISURE TIME

We have seen that industrial changes have, in many different ways, affected the modern home. The same is also true with regard to changes in recreation and in the use of leisure time.[1] For many adults the hours of work are considerably less today than they were under the old agricultural regime. This has meant a corresponding increase in leisure time. For many children there is practically no home-work and, moreover, little opportunity for play. For such there is the problem of child-idleness so common in the more crowded urban districts. Particularly unfortunate for family life is the fact that in the congested districts play has been largely eliminated from the home-hearth. This has involved the loss of some of the values of play as an integrating and training factor in the home.

It was noted that before the revolution in industry, by far the greater part of the leisure time was spent in and around the home. Even at the famous ''bees'' and other neighborhood gatherings the whole family was usually present together. Recreation was home-made. It was a family affair. It came from within the community, even from within the home. The situation made for family unity. It made for parental supervision and protection. It cultivated a sense of loyalty to parents and the home, and it fostered sentiments of love between the family members. It more or less automatically made for due training of children and was, moreover, a very influential family bond.

---

[1] Schmiedeler, E., *The Industrial Revolution and the Home*, Ch. II.

The Younger Children in Rural Homes.—The Industrial Revolution has had considerably less effect upon children of rural families than upon those of the cities. In the former group the situation is still much like that of an earlier day. The change has not made its influence felt there as it has in the city. There are still many and varied outlets for the child's impulses in the open country and these opportunities for play are still in and about the home. When approaching one of the farm homes in his recent rural study, one of the first sights that commonly met the writer's eye was that of several children playing together in the farm yard. Often a little wagon was their chief center of attraction, and pulling and pushing it about, their main activity. At times even an old wheelbarrow served their purpose. In fact, anything on wheels, anything that moved, furnished great sport. "Playing horse" was by no means the least popular of their amusements. Then there was the improvised seesaw made of a board thrown across a log or a stump. To lend a touch of variety, there were plenty of young animals, pigs, calves, and colts. There were the dog and the kittens, a great number of chicks, and perhaps even a gaily bedecked bantam or two strutting around the yard, to the great joy and pride of the youngsters. Undoubtedly commonplace things, these, to the sedate grown-up, but what a part they played in the lives of the children! If the visitor showed but a slight interest, the children's eyes lit up with pleasure, their faces beamed with delight. With the first touch of timidity overcome, they vied with one another to tell about the many wonders on the premises. Birds, flowers, young animals, the open fields, offer many sources of pleasure that are lacking to the city child. Besides, there was the great advantage of being near home and under the observing eye of the mother. Physical and moral danger was reduced to a minimum. Perhaps the chief defect was the lack of companionship of other children. In the case of the children of school age, even this was largely offset by the companionship of schoolmates.

Few exceptions were found to the rule that the younger children in the country are with the parents during leisure-time; whether that was spent within or outside the home. Very generally, too, the children are not surfeited with play. The leisure-time of all except the youngest was quite limited, especially so in summer time. Hence a little extra amusement became a real treat which the parents could readily use as a reward for faithful work or good conduct. Outside of that, it is doubtful whether the parents generally saw any other value in play, except as a means of keeping children occupied and out of harm's way. Gradually to break the child into work was considered very essential. There can be no doubt that this combination of work and play under the direction of the parents made these homes preëminent forces in the training of the children. Moreover, play was an influential family bond in these homes.

The Older Rural Children.—Home conveniences and machinery have to some extent increased the leisure time of the rural family. The automobile has enabled its members to get out of the home for recreation oftener than was the case in earlier days. A considerable amount of complaint is heard that this has led to abuse on the part of the grown children; that they are running around too much and to too great distances. General observation shows that there is at least some foundation for the complaint, that there is an overstepping of due bounds, at times, in the matter. Many lament the fact that parents allow the young people to drive to distant places for their amusements, particularly for their dances. They are suspicious of at least the possibilities of what the framers of the Massachusetts statute had in mind when they declared in unmistakable terms against the "loose and sinful custom of going riding from town to town . . . ofttimes men and women together upon pretense of going to lectures, but it appears . . . much to drink and revel in taverns. . . ." Records show that these colonial legislators took the practical step of trying to eliminate such merrymakings by ordering "that all single persons who merely for their pleasure take such journeys . . . shall be reputed and accounted riotous and unsober persons, and of ill-behavior . . . and shall be committed to prison for ten days, or pay a fine of forty shillings for each offense'' unless they be able to ''give bonds and sufficient securities for good behavior in twenty pounds.''[2] Very few parents today are old-fashioned enough not to realize that in many of these little country places, merrymakings by means of dances, jazz, and whisky are frequent, and the appearance thereat of a representative of the law infrequent. Nor does such a situation tend to foster good morals among the youth who attend. And, beyond doubt, that reacts upon the family.

More ideal situations, it is true, are also found in the country. But they are undoubtedly growing scarcer today. A short time ago the writer happened to be present for a while at a wedding barn-dance. There were about one hundred and fifty people—relatives, neighbors, and friends—in the ''hall,'' and they ranged in age from babies under one year to grandparents of seventy and eighty summers. Such gatherings were common in the rural America of the past. The call to ''swing your partners'' brought the young girl face to face with some one of the immediate neighborhood, well-known and respected there. Often the mother and even the grandmother enjoyed the evening from the sidelines. Perhaps it was Dad's fiddle that resounded with ''Turkey in the Straw.'' Suitable opportunities for companionship and for courtship were provided in this way. But such gatherings are more exceptional now; more restricted to special occasions. The neighborhood gatherings of the past are no longer the ordinary, normal thing. Play is not so much a home-made affair.

Changes in Urban Recreation.—In the city generally, the changes in recreation have been much greater and the effects on the home more far-reaching than in the country. Quite a number of detailed surveys on matters recreational and the use of leisure time, especially in the case of children of school age, have been made.[3] The main conclusions drawn therefrom and the main trends indicated, should yield a fairly typical picture of the country at large.

---

[2] Whitmore, W. H., *Colonial Laws of Massachusetts.*

First of all, the amount of leisure time of the children of school age evidently far surpasses that of early rural times. A very small part—one-fifteenth of the child's time is spent in direct contact with the school. Making allowance for sleep and a generous allowance for study, there would still be about ten hours of the remaining fourteen-fifteenths to be given to work and play. The study of a number of the surveys shows a small proportion of this time spent in such work as selling papers, carrying coal and ashes, going to the store, and the like, on the part of the boys, and taking care of children and helping with various kinds of housework on the part of the girls. Evidently there are still some bits of work to be found for children around some city homes. Yet, in all, only from one-tenth to one-fourth of the ten hours time was given to work.[4]

Of the remainder of the time, a surprisingly high proportion went, not to play, as one might suppose, but to mere idleness.[5] Thus, in the Cincinnati Survey, 45 per cent of the children were found to be idling. Other studies indicate that percentage to be quite general. Again, there is much passive as compared with active recreation. Some studies made have shown the harm that may readily follow idleness and inactivity, and, on the other hand, the good results that flow from active play. This was particularly borne out by the 1916 Cleveland Recreation Survey. It showed that active participation in play is vital. Idling easily becomes harmful and mere spectator type of play is insufficient. Proper development of the child demands that it be roused from lethargy by the invigorating enthusiasm of active play. It is particularly worthy of note that, in the case of many successful citizens whose early life was studied, there had been ample opportunity for play life in their homes and immediate neighborhoods.

---

[3] Cooper, J. M., "The Leisure Time of the School Child" *Catholic Educational Review,* Vol. XX, pp. 208–216.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 208.

[5] *Recreation Survey of Cincinnati,* p. 14.

Recreation and Urban Congestion.—Here is precisely the rub. In our urban centers today the ideal of play and recreation in and about the home is, to say the least, becoming increasingly more difficult. The Industrial Revolution is rapidly urbanizing the rural America of former times, and with this the folk games and amusements connected with the household and simpler community are passing away. Urban congestion hampers play. Normally, the larger the city, the greater the congestion and the limitations of play facilities in and around the home. Urban growth brings high land values, high rent. This means crowded living quarters and the elimination of play space through business and residential expansion. At its worst, play is practically eliminated from the home and immediate neighborhood. The automobile has killed street and curb games and play. At any rate, it has made it extremely dangerous. Perhaps, at best a hidden corner for such games as "craps" may still be found. If there is no play space, where is the child to play?

In the congested sections of Cincinnati, for instance, it was found that only 14.0 per cent of the recreational life of the boy and 26.2 per cent of that of the girl was filled by home amusements.[6] And many other cities cannot boast a less congested condition. Some, in fact, are worse. Where is there room for active sport around home or for team play in the neighborhood, in a New York tenement district, where from 70 to 90 per cent of the lot area is occupied by buildings? In such a situation the child faces the alternative of street play with its delinquency and dodging of the law, or idling, that is no play at all, with its traditional hazards. The wholesome influence of play and all its value in the home becomes an impossibility. And the physical and moral dangers of play away from home are easily recognized. "Street play," says

---

[6] *Recreation Survey of Cincinnati*, p. 14.

Dr. Furfey, "is extremely dangerous. Mr. Earl J. Reader of the National Safety Committee has reported that street play is responsible for most of the traffic accidents in which children are involved. The child who is sent on an errand or who is on his way to school is likely to be careful about crossing the street, but the child who runs after a lost ball will hardly be careful. Merely as a safety measure, therefore, it pays to have plenty of facilities for home play. . . . The moral side also calls for some consideration. The young child needs rather close supervision. As long as he is happily playing in the house, in the yard or in the immediate neighborhood the mother can keep him more or less under observation in the midst of her housework. If, however, he is forced to leave the neighborhood in search of play facilities the consequences may be unfortunate." [7]

The Home and Commercialized Attractions.—But congestion, driving play out of the home, is not the only problem. There is another growth in the modern city that lures the child away—commercialized recreation. With the passing of the home and neighborhood recreations of former days, commerce has come to exploit leisure time in the dance hall, park, and theater.

The cinema, for example, has become a very common form of recreation. Several surveys show that the attendance by children is large, averaging about three times in two weeks. This is at best a passive form of recreation, and only in the smaller neighborhood theaters is family group attendance at all common.

The dance, too, is largely commercialized. To a considerable extent it is out of the home, and even far away from the home neighborhood. And there is a far cry from the hotel dance, growing in popularity, to the barn dance of an earlier day. It would be quite exceptional to find even a near approach to the latter in a large modern city. Very commonly those who attend the dance-halls there are socially unattached in the particular locality. The halls attract their patrons from all parts of the city, as different surveys show. It has become quite customary for both men and women to come to the dance halls separately. Such a thing was unknown in rural days. Nor is there the parental chaperonage of neighborhood dances of the past.

---

[7] Furfey, P. H., *You and Your Children*, pp. 60-61.

In many instances the dance-hall offers practically the only opportunity for boys and girls to associate together. They seek not only amusement but also the companionship of the opposite sex. For many an urban girl, home parties and the like are out of the question. Perhaps, then, at a public dance-hall she will some day meet the "right man" so she can marry. This is a very different situation from that of the average rural girl. Lack of provision for normal companionship of the sexes and for proper courtship speedily makes its influence felt on the home. In fact, this is precisely a fundamental weakness of our machinofacture culture in city life today. Some authorities consider mismating one of the main, if not the chief evils of modern family life. And here, in great part at least, lies the cause of this evil.

In other ways, too, does commerce exploit the leisure-time of the people. Unfortunately the commercialized agencies are primarily interested in profits and not in the culture or lives of the people. They push their allurements, catering to the play impulses in their most vulnerable points, and often with harmful effect to adolescent and even to adult. Even where moral danger may be averted through due supervision, in only too many cases the recreation is of the merely spectator type. Active participation in healthy play is missing. Play in the home thus comes into competition with the commercialized attractions of the bright-light areas. The pleasure-seeker is thereby lured from his home. There is less home play; there is division of play interests; there is separation of family interests; the home's recreational bond is weakened. The family is hampered in its fundamental task of socializing the child. In many ways the home is the loser.

The words of Bernard Fagan, Chief Probation Officer, Children's Court, New York City, show the possibilities of evil in the situation. "I have been witness," he says, "to many an affective scene between parents and their children who have been the victim of some unfortunate experience, and when the sordid tale was related to the court, I have heard with amazement how little the parents knew of the habits and actions of the boys and girls within their own household. These tragedies could in all probability have been avoided if the parents were cognizant of the companions and amusement places of the children. The spirit of watchfulness, of comradeship and understanding is utterly lacking in such homes, and no other result could be expected."[8] To say the least, the words of a man of such wide experience in these matters suggest that some vastly different situations exist in the modern city, than were found in the homes of the past. Yet, it must not be inferred that such conditions are universal in all city parts without distinction. In fact, some situations may be found in sections of cities that are quite the equal of those in rural parts.

Not an Unmixed Evil.—Hand in hand with a changing situation have also arisen changed attitudes towards play. Not only is the greater amount of leisure-time noted, but the relation between delinquency and the use of spare time has become more and more apparent. The possibilities of moral training in the child through play are grasped by increasing numbers. The need for recreation and leisure-time is more fully realized by the parent of today. The value of play as a socializing process is recognized by more. Many parents, too, are demonstrating that, in spite of urban difficulties, the modern home can, under reasonably fair circumstances, be made a real recreational center.

"The young child," writes Dr. Furfey, "spends a great deal of time in play. Once grave adults looked upon this as an appalling loss of time. The expression 'child's play' was used as a synonym for what was a mere useless waste of energy. A deeper knowledge of the psychology of childhood, however, has led to a juster view. We now realize that play is an essential element in growth. The child who does not play is to that extent handicapped in his after life. . . . The parent should plan for the child's play with as much care as is exercised in planning for his education. Play is, in fact, an element in education, and the child who has a rich play life in his early years has reason for gratitude."[9]

---

[8] Fagan, B. J., *Why Boys and Girls Go Wrong*, Proceedings of the Tenth National Conference of Catholic Charities (1924), pp. 48–54.

There has developed a quite generally keener realization of the close relation between the proper growth and development of the child, and the use made of its leisure time. Since the increase of leisure, the idea has grown more and more that the play of children is a first-class educational process which should be made the most of. The play impulses are taken as nature's way and God's, of developing the body, mind, and character. They are being taken more and more seriously as a means of training the young. Play can undoubtedly be a preëminent factor in the developing of the social personality of the child. For instance, through play with its mother in its earliest years, the child learns mutual intercourse and understanding; it learns to subordinate egotistic impulses through play with other children. In the home there is the additional advantage, that companions are not of the child's own choice. It must rub elbows with brother and sister as it finds them.

Thus the attitude has gradually crystallized that play, far from being a necessary evil, is a first-class training process. As a dominant interest in the life of the child, it is from play as well as from work that we should look for progress during this age. Hence, the normal craving for pleasure should not be suppressed but directed into proper channels; it can be used towards most useful ends.

Repeated surveys have shown, too, that play readily becomes an effective agency in preventing delinquency. In fact, the view that provision for play under proper supervision reduces juvenile delinquency is now a commonplace among social workers. The child's play impulses call for an outlet. If they are released along wholesome lines, the boy or girl escapes the many pitfalls of idleness. True, the mere fact that idleness is easily productive of harm is not a new discovery of modern times. Lack of play space, however, is a modern growth, a product of the Industrial Revolution.

---

[9] Furfey, P. H., *You and Your Children*, pp. 60–61.

Yet, withal, it is unfortunate that recreation is so largely out of the home. Urban congestion, driving play away, has shorn the hearth of a power and influence that it formerly exercised through pleasure and leisure time. Some extra-domestic recreation, of course, has its place and also its value. The family can become too ingrowing. But the contrary danger is far more imminent today. There is considerable separation of family members and separation of their recreational interests. That implies a weakening of the recreation bond. Only too frequently do the children get beyond the kindly supervision of their natural guardians. There is enforced idleness, or passive, rather than active play. Parents are hampered in their traditional functions of rearing and training their children. Another basis of family loyalty is sapped of its strength; another family bond is weakened or even broken. Many an urban home has lost thereby both influence and prestige.

The Child in the Country Town.—Perhaps the most satisfactory place for the play-life of the child today is neither in the city nor in the open country, but in the rural town. In this particular group there is in place of the isolation of the rural home, a wider association with other children. On the other hand, the young cannot stray from home as far as can those of the city. Nor are the street dangers and moral hazards as serious as in the city.

The writer recently made it a point to study one particular block of such a town quite closely. There were forty children in the homes of this block and in those immediately surrounding. For hours at a time no vehicle would pass over the roads in this neighborhood, hence not only the spacious yards around the homes, but also the streets were quite freely used as playgrounds. It was not uncommon to see the greater number of these children playing together in one group. Wagons, chutes, ropes, seesaws, sand piles, dust, etc., offered sufficient variety of amusement and kept all occupied for hours at a time. The older children would watch the babies, who were mostly occupying the wagons or playing in the sand and dirt, while the mothers could keep an eye on the whole group from their homes and were readily at hand in case their help or intervention was needed.

Roller-skating, too, was quite popular with this group. At times a half-dozen or more on skates would line up, holding to a rope pulled by one or two leaders, and would strike out for a ‘‘tear’’ across the concrete town walks. To help the excitement, several on scooters might be in the lead, while two or three noisy wagons brought up the rear. ‘‘Rover,’’ unharassed by dog-catchers, contributed his share to the sport by running along the side barking lustily. No police to interfere, no traffic danger to hamper, the grown-ups glad the children were occupied and enjoying themselves—simply an abundance of innocent, unrestrained and wholesome fun. And with all, there was plenty of companionship and the practical supervision of the mother. What a contrast to the play facilities, or lack of them, for children in the congested districts of a large city. And certainly similar descriptions of country towns could be multiplied. Particularly for the young the towns have many wholesome features. They may well serve as an ideal in the future building of our cities. The modern urban family would be the gainer.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. What are the home and neighborhood play facilities in your own community?
2. What forms of commercialized recreation are most detrimental to family life?

3. Has the radio affected the home?

4. Does the cinema in your own community help or hurt the home?

5. Do parents unnecessarily drive their children from the home?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cooper, J. M., "The Leisure Time of the School Child," *Catholic Educ. Review,* Vol. XX, pp. 208–216.
De Schweinitz, K., "New Tools of Leisure," *The Family,* Dec., 1927.
Furfey, P. H., *You and Your Children,* Ch. IX.
————, "Recreation and the Family," *N. C. W. C. Review,* Jan., 1930.
Howe, F. C., *The Modern City and Its Problems,* Ch. XXI.
Norris, K., *Home.*
Schmiedeler, E., *The Industrial Revolution and the Home,* Ch. II.

CHAPTER X

THE CHANGED STATUS OF HUSBAND AND WIFE

A striking change in the family in recent years is the modified status of its members. The position of all family members has been affected. Most profound and far-reaching, however, has been the change in the status of wife and mother. The traditional role of husband and father has naturally been influenced because of the shift in woman's position. And even the child has not been left unaffected. Socially, both gain and loss have resulted. On the one hand, some very really beneficial results have come to the family and its members; on the other, some harmful features have developed, with reactions quite detrimental to the individual and to society. The familial bond of authority has been considerably weakened, so that friction in home life has resulted.

This change in the relations of family members is mainly the result of the changed social position of man, woman, and child. The causes at work in both instances are in great part identical. The very process of social change itself—always disturbing—has not been without some damaging results. Moreover, in some cases abnormal situations developed that served to increase the harmful results the more.

Types of Families.—It was noted before that under the patriarchal system the home was very much a man-ordered world, one of male superiority and dominance. It was built around the husband and father, and practically unlimited authority was centered in him. As the economic, legal, and religious head of the familial group, the man proved to be an integrating and unifying factor in the home. This type of family, very common in historic times, arose in great part out of the social setting of the time. Woman's need for protection, it has been pointed out, did much to promote the patriarchal type of family organization. Tradition and religion alike helped to make it permanent. The possibility of mutual interests and deep affection on the part of husband and wife was not thereby precluded. Still, at least under paganism, with the patriarch's authority largely unrestrained by law of either God or man, opportunity for abuse thereof was very real. History is witness to the fact that the pagan patriarch frequently did misuse his authority in the home to the detriment of both woman and child.

The semipatriarchal Christian type of family also has been noted in an earlier chapter. Under this system the husband and father was still head of the household, but all privilege of misusing his authority over wife and child was definitely set aside by the law of God. Moreover, the Church, ever zealously seeking to protect the weak against the strong, ever strove to make the law effective, particularly by urging the Christian law of love as arbiter in the home. And it may well be taken as axiomatic that the deeper the religious spirit and the more active this Christian law of love in the domestic circle, the better and more satisfying was the condition of all the family members. In the ages of faith the result was a highly integrated family that provided a contented, mutual self-realization on the part of the members. The particular outward form of government was a matter of little or no consequence.

The general drift of more recent times has been in the direction of a more individualistic type of family, sometimes, more or less inaccurately called the equalitarian type. While the tendency quite generally in this country has been in that direction, one can still, as a matter of actual fact, find practically every type of family, from the extreme patriarchal system to groups so individualistic that authority is practically nil and the individual members have become a law unto themselves. The more patriarchal type is still to be found among some people of very isolated districts. The self-assertive, individualistic type is found among the intelligentsia of the higher classes. But the individualistic spirit is also at work among the masses, and is tending toward a greater freedom on the part of family members. Woman, particularly, has come into possession of a freedom that was not hers heretofore. And this change, in turn, has modified the relations of all members toward one another.

The New Status of Woman.—Perhaps the core of recent social changes, as far as womankind is concerned, consists in greater opportunities for personal independence and increased freedom from some of the restrictive conventions of the past few centuries. A larger scope, too, has been given her special abilities, and, in general, a freer and more self-expressing life has become her lot. The notions of the ''New Woman'' and the ''New Freedom'' are inseparable. The extent to which this freedom has actually been realized in individuals and groups, varies greatly. But it has, beyond doubt, been very considerable among many.

The change and its effects can likely be more easily grasped by an examination of some of the fundamental causes that have been producing such far-reaching alterations in the woman's world. This change is, of course, bound up most intimately with the entire modern social transition, and is therefore but one particular aspect of it. It so happens that woman, more than man, has been affected by the liberalizing of culture that has resulted. The various influences at work naturally have not operated separately, but cumulatively, acting and reacting upon one another. Taken together, they constitute the rather clearly defined Woman's Movement which has been making its influence felt throughout the past century and more.

Individualism and the New Woman.—Individualism has been altogether fundamental in creating the so-called new woman and in bringing about her changed condition. ''An ever-increasing number of women,'' writes Goodsell,[1] ''are coming to regard themselves as personalities whose sphere of activity and influence cannot justly be restricted to personal interests in the home. This is, of course, the outcome of the individualistic movement.'' And she adds, ''This individualistic tendency is furthered by the education and professional and business training quite generally bestowed on the girls of the upper and lower classes.'' While there is truth in this statement, there is danger, too, that it may lead to a confusion of terms. A definite distinction betwen individualism, properly so-called, and democracy is useful, if not necessary. Democracy in reality means a maximum of order with a minimum of coercion; a just balance, in other words, between the social and the individual. All the results indicated in the words quoted above might arise from the application of such a democratic notion to our changed cultural situation. Individualism, on the other hand, is a democracy that has over-reached itself. It places undue stress upon personal liberty. It pays little heed to the proper balance between the rights of the individual and his duties to society. In its most extreme form it means rank selfishness, and liberty without restraint. Even the necessary minimum of coercive restraint is then considered an infringement on personal liberty and a reversion to barbarism.

Both a reasonable democracy and a rabid individualism have played not inconsequential parts in the changing status of woman. Democracy has insisted upon the dignity and value of the personality of the individual woman and endorsed her claim and sanctioned her right to liberty, equality, and self-realization. In times of cultural change even the application of such notions to the changed situation are not without some social disturbance. But, eventually, both womankind in particular and mankind in general are sure to be the gainers.

The modern Woman Movement, however, has not merely been characterized by a sane Christian democracy; in many instances it has degenerated into a selfish individualism. This is the other side of the shield, the side that womankind may not be proud of and that will never prove beneficial to civilization. This individualistic spirit has, in fact, led to many abuses and has done much harm. It has made many women self-indulgent and shirking in sacrifice. It has made some irreverent towards authority and restive under all restraint. It has made them neglectful of social duty and of assumed responsibility. In a word, it has made them selfish instead of social.

---

[1] Goodsell, W., *The Family as a Social and Educational Institution*, p. 465.

Such attitudes, and the actions corresponding therewith, on the part of a wife and mother in the home, provide a poor foundation for the family life. Individualism has little to teach about the functions of the family. When the wishes of the individual are placed above the common good of the familial group, a disintegrating influence is at work within the sacred precincts of the domestic world. Clash and conflict, followed by disorganization, are then a certainty.

And, in point of fact, family tensions have not only multiplied but have taken on an extremely serious and sinister aspect. The attitude has grown among the masses that the family is no longer to be taken for granted as an unchangeable and indissoluble union. The individual is no longer satisfied with the right to seek that union which will give him the greatest opportunity to express his personality, but also wishes to dissolve freely the marital ties whenever they become irksome. Responsibility, he believes, is to be shirked when self clamors. The growth of divorce gives ample evidence of this attitude. It is but the expected commentary upon an individualism run rampant. It is true, other causes, too, have been at work.

Education and the Modern Woman.—The changed status of woman is closely linked also with the growth of the education of woman. This growth has been one of the most striking achievements of the past century. The masses of women have the opportunities for education today that were limited to the privileged classes in an earlier day and were withheld from women generally during the centuries preceding the modern Woman's Movement. In colonial America, for instance, prejudice had not only hampered woman in her efforts to get an education on a par with that of man, but it had even commonly excluded girls from the schools developed for the boys.[2] All rapidly changed during the past century. In fact, the number of girls graduating from the high schools of the country very generally exceeds that of the boys.

Obviously, such a change could not fail to exercise a considerable influence upon the status of women. It gave her a necessary tool with which to uphold her rights, her dignity, and her position on a more equal plane with that of man. A more equalized educational opportunity has given husband and wife a greater number of common intellectual interests. That condition should react to the benefit of the home, though in some cases, it is true, obligations to fundamental social customs have been lightly set aside by woman. In as far as the movement for the education of women is properly controlled and directed, it holds great promise of good both to womankind and the race. Further attention will be given this subject later.

Legal and Political Disabilities Removed.—It was to be expected that, with the growth of the Woman's Movement, her political and legal rights and privileges would also increase and be used to good advantage.[3] For a considerable time before suffrage became a law and put a new power into her hands, the influence of government had been brought to bear in many ways upon woman's position. Her legal status had largely been redefined and many legal rights given her that had formerly been denied her. The ballot gave her power to gain further legal and political privileges as well as to safeguard those already possessed. Leaders consider the enfranchisement of women as a very real step forward in the Woman's Movement. To date, the many dire and calamitous results predicted for woman suffrage, have apparently not materialized. But it is perhaps too early to judge just in what way, precisely, the newly acquired rights will influence woman's status.

---

[2] Goodsell, W., *The Family as a Social and Educational Institution*, pp. 403–404.

[3] Goodsell, W., *The Family as a Social and Educational Institution*, pp. 428–433.

Agitation and the Woman's Movement.—The change in woman's status has also been considerably hastened by agitation on the part of women leaders. This has been carried on primarily by the so-called intelligentsia of the upper classes. As a definite movement the agitation dates back particularly to Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women,* issued in the latter part of the eighteenth century. Such leaders as Harriet Martineau, Mary Sommerville, and George Eliot, carried the movement forward in the early days of the nineteenth century, and their band has ever increased down to the present. Their agitation has to no small extent reached the masses.

Not all the results have been for betterment. A certain percentage of the more vocal leaders have been of an erratic type. Not a small number have had a false conception of the true woman and have taken equality with man to mean identity with him. All attempts to carry out such an unnatural program could only result in harm and be foredoomed to failure. Particularly, this effort to make woman a sorry double of man, instead of developing her characteristic powers and capacities by maintaining the differences between her and man, has surrounded the Woman's Movement with a semblance of unreality that has prejudiced many against it. Moreover, the harmful vaporings of extreme radicals, of soured misfits with a social grudge to air, and of discontented divorcees with an emotional tension to relieve, have contributed considerably to the sum total of confusion and dissatisfaction within the ranks of women themselves. This circumstance has not improved woman's standing. And not a little discord and disintegration have resulted in the home.

The Industrial Revolution a Factor.—Undoubtedly the chief factor in bringing about a change in woman's position has been the Industrial Revolution, the cause of such far-reaching changes in our whole industrial system. Without the latter, the Woman's Movement would likely have made little headway. It would hardly have reached the great masses of women effectively. The extent to which the great transition from the handicraft and agricultural stage to our machinofacture culture has affected womankind industrially has already been noted. It is worthy of note, however, that those who did not leave their homes to work have, nevertheless, been influenced in various ways by the industrial change. Their leisure time, for instance, has very generally been increased. This has provided them with more time for self-development and for the higher things of home-making. Work outside the home and many new stimulations and responses engendered by these wider social experiences have left their imprint upon them. Many still clamor for these stimulations after marriage and are dissatisfied without them. Their satisfying, however, involves a condition far less restrictive than was generally that of the wives and mothers of the past. And, in fact, the modern wife and mother is no longer so closely house-bound as was her sister of the past generation.

But perhaps the most influential single result of the change in woman's status has been her economic independence, both potential and actual. This has put into her hands a powerful weapon with which to safeguard and enforce the rights she has attained, as well as a tool wherewith to obtain others. All in all, the whole vast social upheaval caused by the Industrial Revolution has gone very far in lifting woman to a plane of social and economic equality with man. Here again, unfortunately, the change has meant for some but a means of escape from expected duties and serious obligations, voluntarily assumed upon entering the married state. Though a boon, indeed, to womankind in many ways, the change nevertheless has produced some very harmful social results.

The Debit and Credit Columns.—Some of the chief factors that have been at work in changing woman's status and developing the modern woman have been indicated. Political, industrial, legal, educational, and social changes have played a part. In various ways the results have been a marked gain for womankind. There has been an extension of woman's rights and the achievement of a greater freedom. Gains in one field have but served to make for progress in another, and the total result has been a greatly altered status. It would be difficult to evaluate the entire movement to date. But, certainly, on the credit side are found greater privileges and increased opportunities; in a word, more freedom for woman.

Yet, with equal certainty is there also a debit side. The change in status has turned the head of not a few women. They have come to shirk duty and responsibility. They have become petulant and spoiled adults. Restless and fickle, these bode no good to society. In fact, they greatly harm the Woman's Movement. It is especially to some of this latter group that Anna Garlin Spenser [4] refers in answering her own question, "Can Women Have All the New Freedom and All the Old Privileges?" "Some women," she writes, "are trying the absurd and dangerous experiment of seeing how much they can take from men in the old lines of 'support' and how little they can give in the old lines of service; how much they can gain in the new freedom and how little they can pay for it in individual work. These are the women who are willing that the family property shall be in their name for the purpose of cheating creditors, and at the same time acknowledge no obligation to support the children from a common fund. These are the women who demand their liberty to achieve, and deny their duty to help. These are the women who take 'alimony' from a man with whom they will not live and have married for their own convenience. They are the women who have independent incomes from inheritance or from vocational success and yet excuse themselves from any responsibility towards even invalid husbands, and never see the parental bond as now binding both fathers and mothers alike.'' And she adds, ''Many men are struggling in some confusion of mind as to the outcome of this new tendency to equalize rights and opportunities, and to the credit of most of them, be it spoken, they want to do the right thing.'' There are, in fact, so many women of the above-mentioned and similar types that a considerable shadow has been thrown over the whole Woman's Movement. Some have even come to consider her changed status a disappointment, a doubtful asset to mankind and to the race. Certainly there is ample room for correction of attitudes on the part of some of their number. Otherwise, many modern fathers and husbands will have to continue ''struggling in confusion of mind.''

---

[4] Spenser, A. G., *The Family and its Members*, pp. 87–88.

Man's Changed Status.—The comprehensive changes in the status of woman could result only in some change in man's position and authority. The whole new situation has, as a matter of fact, given rise to a great number of conflicting claims in the home on the part of husbands and wives. Even where both are genuinely eager amicably to adjust differences that arise, a lack of well-established standards to meet the new situation proves in some instances a very real barrier to suitable adjustment.

A Conflict of Attitudes.—Undoubtedly many of the differences that arise between husband and wife in the home today, grow out of divergent attitudes regarding one another's position in the home. The average husband still has the traditional conception of woman's place in the home. He takes it for granted that his wife's attitudes are still the same, because such were the views of his own mother and grandmother. The truth is, however, that many modern women have very considerably changed their notions regarding woman's and man's respective positions in the home. Many of them, therefore, show dissatisfaction and even resentment when the husband presumes to exercise leadership in the home and a quasi-protectorship over the wife which he thinks social convention still demands of him. When their divergent views eventually come to the surface, clashes are frequently the result. When both are zealously eager to bring all their views into unison for the good of the domestic kingdom, compromises, leading to final adjustment and family equilibrium, naturally result. But where a selfish individualism holds sway, repeated differences will lead from bad to worse, and disorganization rather than equilibrium will be the ultimate consequence. Undoubtedly the latter is the case in an increasing number of instances today. And frequently the basis of the trouble is merely failure to understand their divergent attitudes regarding the proper status of husband and wife in the home.

More Expected of the Husband To-day.—While the status of woman has been considerably enhanced, the prerogatives of man have correspondingly tended to wane. Yet, in spite of this fact, more is expected of many husbands today than in the past. This is due particularly to the growth of romanticism that has arisen out of woman's increased leisure time and kindred causes. This change leads many wives to complain more freely than formerly, if the husband shows a lack of marital and domestic interest. Such wives consider the home, first and foremost, a matter of mind and heart, and not of financial support and mere physical existence. They object, on the one hand, to the husband's centering too much time and attention in extra-domestic pursuits. They object to settling down to a mere humdrum and routine existence in the home. They expect, on the other hand, that the husband keep up more of the spirit of chivalry and affectionate attention of courtship days. They expect more attention for themselves and more effort centered in the creation of a home spirit. They insist upon more of the higher and richer spiritual joys of married life.

While some women have undoubtedly been led to expect too much, and are too romantic, the criticisms leveled at some men for their negligent attitudes towards the home are also frequently deserved. The very severity of business competition in the modern world tends to distract the attention of many men from their homes. In other activities, also, the trend is away from the home. This is a different situation from that created by the community of interests in and around the home, so characteristic of the families of the past. It frequently necessitates more of an artificial effort to cultivate due interest in the home and in family affairs. The man who gives more attention to his business life than to his married life, has a wrong set of values. The one who feverishly pursues fame and fortune to the exclusion of proper interest in wife and children, will be disillusioned and will prove a disappointment to his family.

There are such husbands in considerable numbers to-day. But there are others too, such, namely, as find the real values of life within the domestic circle. It is, of course, of those who fail to retain an interest in the home rather than those who develop an increasing comradeship as time goes on, of whom women complain. Dr. Groves [5] well describes the present situation as he notes two divergent trends in the reactions of men to-day. ''Some men show, as the marriage goes on, a lessening of conscious need of family experience. Men of this sort have their richest family life at the start and move from the early days of marriage irresistibly toward a life program which is essentially like that enjoyed before their wedding. The lessening importance of the home as a means of administering human comfort provides opportunity for many men to grow away from the home as they advance in years. . . . The trend has already gone so far that it is not surprising that we have from some the proclamation that the normal matrimonial career for the husband as well as for the wife should largely pass away as the momentum of early physical attraction lags and largely disappears.

---

[5] Groves, E. R. and Ogburn, W. F., *American Marriage and Family Relationship,* pp. 40–42.

"Other men develop an increasing comradeship as time goes on. To them the family from the start has had the possibility of greater growth. Each family season bears its characteristic fruit. These men do not regret the passing of spring, because there have been no losses not offset by greater gain. To this group marriage has not been exclusively a sex experience, nor are they, if they have children, merely responsible during the time when the children are young and necessarily must have assistance."

Dr. Groves, moreover, points out the source of this difference in attitude in the two groups, namely a greater or lesser degree of domesticity. "The first class," he writes, "is likely to find in marriage a temporary zest purchased at the price of irksome obligations that are shaken off the moment social convention and conscience permit, while the other group are those who are drawn to the home as the means of fulfilment of the entire range of human desires. There is no reason to suppose that either group will so predominate as to be the standard. These differences have always existed between men; it is merely true now that present culture permits husbandhood to be, like parenthood, largely a matter of choice." And one can readily agree with the same writer when he states that it is the first group that furnishes the larger proportion of divorces, because they become intolerant of domestic responsibility.

What Will the Change Bring?—That the status of husband and wife in the home has been changing, is an undoubted fact. In essence it has meant greater freedom for women, a greater equality of the sexes. This change is but a part of a far more comprehensive social transition. All our institutions, in fact, are being gradually readapted to fit the new conditions of our machinofacture culture. Such a period of social change always carries with it a certain amount of risk or danger. There is the ever-present danger of discarding some essentials while throwing overboard non-essentials or useless luggage. In the case of the familial change, there has undoubtedly been some instability and also a weakening of the bond of authority. What the ultimate result will be depends little upon what terms are applied to the shifting situation; whether, for instance, we speak of it as a transition from a patriarchal to a more equalitarian type of family, or from a monarchial to a more democratic form. But it will depend entirely upon whether all the good of the family of the past is conserved and whether woman will use her new status in unsatisfying selfish pursuit or in lifting home-life to a new and higher cultural level.

The comment of Margaret Fletcher on the present situation is not only of interest but also carries with it a lesson from history that should prove a helpful guide in the transitional period through which we are passing. Referring to the conflicting claims of the modern husband and wife, she writes:[6] "There is undoubtedly much searching of hearts among young people as to the extent to which women's improved education and civil equality is to affect the relationship of husband and wife. Gradually we should more nearly approach the ideal liberty-respecting government and the interpretation of authority as the recording of a casting vote rather than the exercise of a stronger will to enforce the acceptance of personal opinions and predilections. Where the marriage is Christian in the highest and fullest sense, there can be no question of conflict or crushed individualities, for it is a case of one-ness, and mutual self-realization. . . . Revolutionary as recent changes seem to us who have lived through them, it is doubtful if, allowing for the different social setting, we have recovered all the equality of the sexes to be found in the Middle Ages in which the Christian family flourished. We have certainly not recovered it on the same solid ground or in conditions so fruitful in producing great characters and forceful personalities. Some adjustments there will be in habits and customs, inevitable and logical. Now that practically all artificial sex barriers are removed, we shall look on at a process like that of water finding its own level.

---

[6] Fletcher, M., *The Christian Family*, pp. 54–55.

"It will take some time for the new forces now let loose to find a position of stable equilibrium; our function for the moment is merely to look on. We may hope that prophets both of woe and of triumph will for the time being be content to roll up their scrolls and join our ranks. We have had too much theory based upon assumptions which have proved false; we now await facts."

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. What do you consider the most far-reaching cause of the changed status of women?
2. In what way has the familial status of the modern child changed?
3. Show the development of higher education for women in the United States.
4. To what extent has the modern movement for the higher education of women tended to produce a reluctance to face the burdens of maternity?
5. Compare the status of the modern American woman with that of the Roman matron and of the Christian mother of the Middle Ages.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bosanquet, H., *The Family,* Chs. XI, XII, XIII.
Cooper, J. M., *Religion Outlines for Colleges,* Course IV, Ch. IX.
Fletcher, M., *The Christian Family,* Chs. III, VI.
Gerrard, T. J., *Marriage and Parenthood,* Ch. VI.
Goodsell, W., *The Family as a Social and Educational Institution.*
Groves, E. R. and Ogburn, W. F., *American Marriage and Family Relationships,* Chs. III, IV, V.
Meyer, O. F. M., F., *Plain Talks on Marriage,* Ch. VII.
Spenser, A. G., *The Family and its Members,* Chs. VII, VIII.

CHAPTER XI

Perversions of Love

The strongest natural force to bind the family group together, as already intimated, is love. Mutual affection between husband and wife, deepened through the cultivation of common interests and enriched through the development of parental impulses as children come into the home, provides the safest security against disintegration of the family group. Such love always places familial welfare above personal pleasure. It is not limited to mere sensuous love nor to sentimental romantic feeling, but always includes mutual appreciation and primarily aims at the common welfare of the marital mates. It cultivates the altruistic or other-centered elements of love and is not content with fostering the more selfish and self-centered. It recognizes the sacrifice of self for the sake of partner and children as a prime requisite to a satisfactory family relationship. It appreciates, in a word, the need of a normal interplay between all the constituent elements of love.

To-day, however, we find that one of the greatest sources of family disintegration is precisely the perversion of such genuine love. In various ways has this fundamental bond of family life been made to suffer. Undue emphasis is placed upon the romantic or the more sentimental side of love. The mere physical element of affection is stressed, and frequently it is totally isolated from the more spiritual elements. In consequence there is a corresponding neglect of the sacrificial and altruistic elements of affection, which results in a failure to develop the parental impulses. The growth of such false tendencies could be accompanied only by a proportionate increase in undisciplined and characterless individuals, and in domestic discord and familial disintegration.

Selfish Pleasure versus Altruistic Sacrifice.—Fundamental in this unwholesome growth has been the development of a veritable pleasure philosophy of life and a corresponding decrease in self-discipline and self-sacrifice. With the growth of comforts and conveniences proper to our applied-science age, the old notions of character—sacrifice, self-denial, self-control, moral stamina, and the virile virtues—have given place to a creed of softness and a philosophy of ease and unrestraint. The *Zeitgeist* has divinized personal pleasure. Discipline of life has become old-fashioned.

Carried over into family life, these notions have really involved the substitution of a secondary for the primary end of marriage. Personal happiness has become for many the acid test of successful family life. The begetting and rearing of children has been shoved into the background and in some instances altogether excluded. Yet, it is precisely the children who must form the final link in the chain that is to hold the family group together. Normally such an ephemeral bond as personal happiness cannot do so. The truth of the matter is that the family, like all other human institutions, involves no small amount of discipline of life. It demands sacrifice, for it is replete with tasks and even hardships. In other words it is a job and not a joy-ride, and modern attempts to ground home-life upon a pleasure basis are certain to lead to increased family failure. It was but to be expected that with the growth of such unsound attitudes there would be an increased demand for the dissolution of the marriage bond when the premeditated happiness failed to materialize.

MODERN ROMANTICISM AND THE FAMILY

One of the developments which rose out of the pleasure-craze and soft creed of our fluid age is an undue emphasis upon the romantic side of love. Just as the highly spiritual romantic love of the days of chivalry eventually degenerated into the unsavory attractions of courtier and courtesan in some of the higher classes of an earlier day, so did a reasonably controlled romantic impulse of colonial times give way gradually to an exaggerated and sentimental emotionalism that could not last—to an ethereal impulse that could give very little substance to family life. This modern development is worthy of some special attention.

The Growth of the New Romanticism.—Besides the modern philosophy of pleasure, a number of more immediate and specific causes have played a part in the development of this modern romanticism. Thus, it was that hand in hand with the relaxation of parental control over courtship youth came to consider marriage more a matter of romantic adventure than a serious and responsible undertaking in which society as well as the individual is much concerned. This attitude was also fostered by the increase of leisure-time which gave more time for idealization, for day-dreaming, and for selfish pleasure. Again, it received additional impetus through a vast love-story literature that stressed the romantic ideals of courtship and marriage to the exclusion of the realistic. More recently the cinema has played a considerable part in fostering the growth of this sentimental impulse. Basic, of course, was the growth of luxury and comfort, with its resultant softness and pleasure-seeking on the one hand, and its rejection of self-denial and self-restraint on the other. Accustomed to side-stepping difficulties or to escaping from them into a dream world, the individual was left unprepared to meet the hard realities of life. Led to expect a perpetual honeymoon after marriage, or a life permanently keyed up to a high pitch of ecstatic emotion, he found himself without sufficient strength for the unescapable tasks of family life at the very point where the ephemeral enthusiasm of courtship subsided into a more balanced family equilibrium. It was a foregone conclusion that marriage and the family would suffer.

Gradually an unholy growth of unsound and even freakish theories, such as "love at first sight" and "the soul mate," became current. Particularly did love alone become the sole basis of marriage for many. Little or no attention was given to such weighty considerations in the choice of a mate as mutuality of interests, similarity of ideals, sameness of cultural background, and congeniality of temperament. Hence, even if the affection that formed the original basis of marriage may have been sincere, there was little in the lives of the two contracting persons to nourish and strengthen it. But in only too many cases the love that became the prime consideration and even sole basis of marriage, was counterfeit to begin with, namely, a mere passing infatuation. It did not grow out of admiration for personal, spiritual qualities but out of a sentimental desire for response, attention, and caress, or for physical sex-expression. Hurried marriages took on proportions. And marrying in haste is a prolific source of repenting at leisure.

Disillusionment and Dissolution.—A faulty emphasis upon the romantic impulse could bring only one inevitable result—eventual disillusionment. It was but natural that as the number of those grew who set their heart upon a continuation during marriage of the same high pitch of sentimental emotionalism experienced in courtship, so the number of those also grew who failed satisfactorily to make the transition into normal and satisfying married life.

Disillusioned in their first attempts to realize their ideals of supreme and ecstatic happiness, the demand grew for the dissolution of such marriages and for the formation of new alliances. Some radical feminists preached even the doctrine that the very validity of a marriage depended upon the continuance of romantic love. The logical extreme of this was, of course, the advocacy of "free love." The way was open for much marital tension and domestic disorganization.

As the number of disillusioned and divorced individuals grew, a skeptical and even cynical attitude towards marriage began putting in its appearance. Instead of looking forward to marriage and parenthood as one of the noblest and most beautiful experiences of life, as a climax to existence and one of the highest things to which men and women can aspire, these skeptics and cynics took the attitude that marriage was but a temporary alliance, to be entered upon in doubt and hesitation, with a high expectancy of failure, and with a determination to break the contract as soon as difficulties arose. Their attitude made a genuine organization of a family group impossible. It precluded a whole-hearted surrender to the marriage project. Certainly, such a development boded nothing but ill for the family. To build a home upon cynicism and skepticism is to build upon shaky foundations indeed. In such cases the builder himself does not pretend that his house shall stand when the inevitable storms of life brew and the winds of adversity blow. In such cases disintegration of the home becomes the expected thing.

There is, of course, nothing to be gained by over-rating the extent of these developments; yet, there is no doubt that they have become fairly common and that they are even rapidly becoming a part of our very culture. A faulty romanticism, with its inevitable offspring of disillusionment and divorce, of cynicism and skepticism, has become embedded in our civilization. And the reaction on that civilization can only be injurious.

Emphasis upon Sex.—Hand in hand with the growth of the romantic or more sentimental element of the love complex there also developed a disproportionate stress upon the merely physical or sex element. The fundamental cause of the latter development was largely identical with that of the former. At times also this twofold growth of a common root is none too clearly distinguishable. Like romanticism, emphasis upon physical sex has struck a blow at genuine love. It has done much to undermine family affection. Undue stress upon the physical, means neglect of the spiritual and, consequently, an abnormal situation, a perversion of genuine love.

The Physical versus the Spiritual in Love.—True love naturally involves a normal interplay of all the essential elements of affection. Hence, it is abnormal to isolate sex passion from the spiritual and sacrificial elements of love. It involves a stamping in of the separative and unsocial impulse of selfishness in the individual and leaves undeveloped the coöperative and binding spirit of altruism. Such stress upon the physical side of sex, whether within or outside the married state, is harmful to the individual and to society; thus the attempt to base marriage and family life mostly, or entirely, on mere physical sex is to court shipwreck on the matrimonial sea of life. In itself passion has little substance. It is ephemeral and does not last. Hence, if the more substantial and integrating elements of affection have been crowded out or left undeveloped, no stable foundation is left for lasting marriage. Disorganization and decay are all too likely to result.

It is the opinion of many that emphasis upon the merely physical side of love has grown very considerably and is exercising a detrimental influence on the family. This emphasis is found alike outside of marriage and within. In both cases it has proved itself not only a cultivation of a low order of love but also one that involves a progressive limitation of power to carry life to the highest altitudes of love's experience. It implies the sacrifice of the lasting and compelling power of love at its best for the passing thrills of a cheap emotionalism.

But not only does emphasis upon sex stamp in selfishness and reject the more altruistic and sacrificial character of love; it also, to a great extent, causes a lack of development of the parental impulses, the most substantial element in the love complex. Enfeebled parental impulses, it is true, may also result from forms of incomplete or arrested family-life other than those that flow from a perverse or undue use of the sex impulse. While these latter forms may not do harm by positively stamping in selfishness, they may nevertheless contribute at least negatively towards the sum total of disorganized family life by leaving the parental impulses totally or partially undeveloped. These various types of arrested family-life are perhaps most conveniently treated as a group.

Arrested Family Life.—Various conditions may interfere with the normal functioning of the family and thus lead to different types of incomplete family-life. Very commonly this affects the bond of family love and involves a weakening of the familial group. Thus, there is the barren marriage, due to sterility on the part of one or both of the mates. Then, too, there is deliberate abortion and the now common practice of artificial birth-control. All of these add their quota to the ever-increasing number of childless and near-childless marriages, and are usually not without some effect on the integrating bond of affection.

Sterility.—Sterility is quite a common cause of incomplete family life. It is nothing new to the race; it has ever been found in the past. Nothing can prevent the normal functioning of a family more completely than sterility. The results are also personally unfortunate in all cases in which the individuals really desire children. Even though involuntary, its presence makes it more difficult for man and wife to keep up a satisfying relationship, than would be the case in the normal relationship of father, mother, and children. The parental impulses are left undeveloped and there is a noticeable void in the home. It is an abnormal family situation.

Many different causes have been suggested for infertility, both on the part of the man and that of the woman. Thus, it is apparently induced in some cases by postponing childbearing until some indefinite time in the future. When, eventually, such mates make up their minds to let nature have its lawful course, they frequently find that it disappoints them. Again, there is no doubt that to-day one of the most frequent causes of barrenness is gonorrhea. The elimination of this disease would be one of the most certain ways of decreasing sterility. While medical science has made some headway in dealing with the causes of sterility, there is still left here a vast field for exploration and investigation. Certainly one of the safest ways of insuring continued fecundity is by marrying into healthy and fecund families wherein children have been numerous.[1]

Abortion.—Another considerable cause of arrested family life is abortion. It consists in the criminal destruction of the unborn, a brutal and inhuman means of setting aside the normal purposes of marriage. It ranks high among the serious hindrances to the development of normal family-life and of spiritual affection. Besides the serious physical and moral consequences involved, there is the perversion of the feelings normally associated with motherhood and child-love. It brutalizes rather than develops the parental impulses.

The practice of abortion has become very extensive in this country. Conservative social-workers place the number at no less than 250,000 a year. More common estimates suggest about 1,000,000 annually. Other estimates vary from 50,000 to 3,000,000. Since the practice is illegal it is kept under cover to a great extent. Hence reliable statistics are unavailable. There is no doubt, however, that the practice is very widespread and it is apparently increasing with the growth of our materialistic and individualistic culture.[2]

Artificial Birth-control.—But the most common cause of incomplete family life to-day is the voluntary restriction of families through the artificial limitation of births. And this has become a powerfully disintegrating influence in modern family life. It has given selfish sex a free hand, while throttling the unselfish parental impulses. As a result the fundamental bond of family affection has little vitality in many families and the group easily falls apart. Moreover, even if the shell of a family remains, the primary functions have been deliberately set aside.

A variety of causes lie at the bottom of this practice. Some of the factors at work are economic difficulties, poor health, professional interest, fear of child-birth, social ostracism, and selfish pleasure. No small amount of propaganda has been used to foster the movement. Public opinion with regard to the practice has changed very decidedly in recent years. A few decades ago the mother of a large family was honored; to-day, particularly in urban parts, she is frequently pitied if not even thought foolish. Only recently, a prominent national organization expressed its chief aim in the slogan—"Make birth-control respectable!"

---

[1] Popenoe, P., *The Conservation of the Family*, Ch. VII.

[2] *Ibid.*, Ch. IX.

The economic reason frequently given for the practice of birth-control is a desire to raise the standard of living or to keep it at a proper level. Perhaps more often than not, this is a mere rationalization inasmuch as those advancing the reason live very definitely above the average level. Hence, their plea is without truth or reason. But on the other hand, instances occur in which an increase in the family might mean real suffering and destitution to the father and mother. Such cases call for serious consideration.

But the remedy does not lie in a frustration of nature and in denying human beings the joys of parenthood. Rather is it to be found in the adjustment of an industrial situation that causes such economic stress in our land of plenty that the average individual cannot marry and rear a normal family. A more humane system of industry and not an inhuman restriction of the family is the logical remedy. A living family wage, for instance, and not an artificially limited family should meet the situation. And, where the economic difficulty or other reason nevertheless remains, continence rather than contraception, self-control rather than birth-control, must be brought into play. After all, that is the only fully effective remedy. No contraceptives are even near-infallible. Ethically, of course, the danger of suffering does not justify the violation of a moral law. Inconvenience to the individual does not confer the right to break down that which is for the common good. But this attitude of fostering the common good rather than private convenience naturally fails to harmonize with the *Zeitgeist* of a soft and undisciplined age.

Illness on the part of either husband or wife is advanced as the reason for some cases of voluntary family limitation. More commonly, however, is this reason given by the woman than by the man. An abnormal fear of pregnancy has to-day taken possession of not a few women. Unfortunately the idea has become prevalent that there is something pathological about child-bearing. Birth-control advocates have had a part in creating this erroneous opinion, and, though perhaps unwittingly, the medical profession also seems to have had its share. As a matter of fact, pregnancy is a beneficial experience to the mother. Normally, it increases her well-being, physically and mentally.

Though there is much exaggeration in this whole field of health, as a reason for birth-control, there are some real difficulties and some cases that deserve the greatest consideration. Too frequent child-bearing may keep the mother in such a weakened condition that both normal health and the performance of her tasks are beyond question. Many such cases would, however, normally and automatically take care of themselves if mothers nursed their own offspring, as the greater majority can and should do. Where the mother does not nurse her own child, conception is much more likely to take place shortly after child-birth and the repeated child-bearing becomes what nature never intended, a drain upon the mother. Where the mother does nurse her child, conception ordinarily does not take place till after the weaning, that is, after nine or ten months. Thus, there is a spacing of about two years between each child and the average mother gets ample time in which to build up her normal strength.

In case there is some immediate serious danger, either of breakdown in the mother's health or even of death to mother or child, the remedy is not so simple as birth-control advocates would have one believe. The medical profession admits there are no guaranteed birth-control methods. None of them are infallibly certain and, hence, may prove to be no remedy whatever. The only safe remedy at such trying times—short at least of serious surgical measures—is continence.[3] While not in accord with the unrestraint of the age, it is, quite aside from all moral considerations, certainly expected of the man who has respect for his wife as his spouse and as the mother of his children. Moreover, such kindly considerations will as certainly increase and deepen the affection between mates as the contrary conduct will serve to decrease it. The whole question of health, as will be pointed out in greater detail elsewhere, deserves most serious consideration before marriage is entered upon.

Beyond all doubt, however, the chief reason for the prevailing artificial restriction of the family is selfish pleasure. Very many people to-day follow a determined policy of carrying out this practice for reasons of personal advantage or simply to obtain the fascinating pleasures of sex while at the same time shirking the ordinary responsibilities of orthodox family life. Particularly in the case of the well-to-do, is the foundation for the practice frequently that a small family, or none at all, will make it easier for woman to enjoy the liberty and independence she craves. The sacrifice of time and personal interest required of the mother in rearing many children, does not harmonize with some of the current aspirations for feminine freedom. Moreover, some of the women who worked before marriage may find that, giving up their former enjoyments and their earlier recreations and mode of life to which they had grown accustomed, and taking up the confining and exacting duties of child-bearing and child-rearing, involves sacrifices which they are little disposed to make. Many of these have developed a set of false values of life. Nor is the relation between the whole so-called birth-control movement and the woman's movement an altogether insignificant one.

Another reason advanced at times for birth-control is the good of the child. In the smaller family the child should have a better start in life and its mother should be a better guide and companion for it because of her increased opportunity to continue her mental culture and personal development. As a matter of fact, however, the insidious and infectious maladies of luxury and selfishness that have grown so rapidly with the advent of the small family, have not only affected the adult but also the child. Only too readily does the child in the small family develop self-centered and unsocial attitudes if it does not become even spoiled and anti-social.

---

[3] Cooper, J. M., *Religion Outlines for Colleges*, Course IV, pp. 143–145.

It is worthy of note that this practice of restriction is not easily controlled by the individual. It is a habit or attitude not so easily started and stopped at will. And, as a result, in some quarters this trifing with nature and her laws has already proved a veritable death doctrine. It is already abundantly apparent that the term ''race suicide'' was well chosen by a great American leader and that it is full of deep meaning.

Primarily an Urban Problem.—That the birth-rate in the rural districts is generally larger than that in the cities is usually taken for granted. The truth of the assumption has been shown conclusively by the extensive study of Warren S. Thompson.[4] ''Not only in the United States as a whole,'' he writes, ''was the proportion of children to women larger in the rural districts than in the urban districts, but this was also true for every State in the Union. In the New England States the difference was not large—a little over 19 per cent—and in Massachusetts it was only 9.6 per cent. In some States, however,.the difference was over 80 per cent—86.5 per cent in North Dakota and 83.3 per cent in Tennessee.''

In the cities the proportion of children was found to be quite uniformly between 300 and 400 to 1,000 women of between 15 and 44 years. In sharp contrast to this uniformity was the wide variation in the proportion of children in the rural population, namely, from 412 in Massachusetts to 792 in Utah. For the country, as a whole, the total number of children (white) under 5 years per 1,000 women of between 15 and 44 years was 382 in urban parts and 603 in rural districts. The total number of children of between 5 and 9 years per 1,000 women between 15 and 44 years was 314 in the cities as compared with 555 in the country.

---

[4] Thompson, W. S., "Race Suicide in the United States," *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, Vol. III, p. 1, (1920).

In great part at least, this noticeable difference is due to artificial birth-restriction. The practice has made greater headway in the city than in the country. It is in the urban and not so much in the rural group that we find fewer children and smaller families. While there are many ideal families indeed to be found in our cities, it is there that apartment houses—those temples of race-suicide that at times specifically exclude children—are ever increasing in popularity. In these great industrial centers many married couples do not keep houses at all. There even seems to be much truth in the statement of a recent writer that there is in America a spirit of studied homelessness which correlates with the social and industrial changes since 1850. Such a situation is an unwholesome one for family life and for the fulfiling of the prime purpose of the family—the begetting and rearing of children.

A Question of Human Welfare.—Artificial family restriction is injurious not only to the family and its members but also to the wider human welfare. Such is also the case with all sex aberration, such as adultery, solitary vice, or sex satisfaction outside of the married state. Humanity's higher welfare demands the growth of unselfishness in mankind. A considerable amount of coöperation is essential for healthy social life. Unselfishness fosters such social coöperation. Yet, the human being is naturally inclined rather toward selfishness, and one of the most powerful influences to stamp this tendency in is precisely a misuse of the sex impulse. Normal marriage and parenthood, on the other hand, counteract it as perhaps no other single force.

Like all forms of unchastity, artificial family limitation isolates the selfish element in the love complex and stamps it in. It divinizes sex passion, always in itself self-seeking and self-centered, and undermines inevitably unselfish love, which is ever the true strength of the marriage bond. It hinders the normal functioning of mankind's great training school for the unselfishness that is so essential for wholesome social life, namely, parenthood, or home-making and child-rearing.

Parenthood on the other hand diverts the selfish element into altruistic channels. It diverts interests from self in many different ways and centers them in the offspring. It is estimated that domestic life holds sway in about nine-tenths of life. In other words, 90 per cent of the interest of parents naturally centers in home life and in loved ones. This becomes a tremendous influence in drawing the human being out of his selfish shell and in developing the spirit of sacrifice and altruism within him.[5]

While these considerations hold with special force in the case of the totally restricted family, they are also true, though in perhaps lesser degree, in the case of the small restricted family. As mentioned before, there is great danger of selfishness both for child and adult in the small family. This point is very well brought out by Dr. Cooper in an apt comparison between the children of a small family and the family pets. "We keep one or two dogs, for instance. They are a care. But they give many compensations that are familiar to all lovers of dogs. The compensations, balanced against the care, outweigh the latter. But not many people go in for having four or five dogs.

"The case is quite similar with offspring, towards whom the parental cravings and compensation are psychically close kin to if not identical with those toward household pets. One or two children are certainly a care. But the compensations for one or two offspring balanced against the care, outweigh the latter with most couples. At about this point however, a law of diminishing returns sets in. Where there are only one or two or even three children, the ordinary contraceptive quota, the compensations outbalance the sacrifices. Where the number, however, goes beyond into four or five or six children, the compensations do not appreciably increase, whereas the sacrifices do, and so the sacrifices outbalance the compensation.''[6] Nor is the woman who has given birth to all the noble ideals and sentiments that to-day center in motherhood and are treasured and revered by the race, the nervously fidgety trifler with nature; she is rather the peacefully contented and satisfied mother of a normal family.

---

[5] Cooper, J. M., *Religion Outlines for Colleges*, Course IV, pp. 138–139.

Genuine Love and the Family Group Affected.—These various perversions of a normal and wholesome love have done much to weaken this most fundamental natural bond of family life. Such growths as modern romanticism, birth-control, and other forms of arrested family life, as well as sex excesses generally, have done much to undermine the more stable and lasting elements of affection. And family life has adversely suffered greatly as a result.

Familial love has also been affected by the changes that have weakened other family bonds. Such a bond, for instance, as the recreational served in great part to integrate the home because of the fact that it nourished family affection. Such was also the case with other bonds, though they had other binding power quite aside from this fact.

The truth is that all family bonds—powerfully integrating forces in the family of the past—have been adversely affected, to some extent at least, in modern times. And the sum total result is the disorganized and disintegrated condition of the present time. Thus we have seen that recent cultural changes have weakened the industrial, the economic, and the recreational bonds. The authoritative bond has also decreased in influence, due to such causes as the changed status of husband and wife in the home, the rationalizing of conduct, and the weakening of the religious bond of the family. The two forces of religion and authority were ever closely linked in the Christian past. But in our own country religion has come to sit so lightly upon the shoulders of the people that approximately half of them profess no affiliation with any particular church group and many of the other half have been not a little affected by the soft creed of the day.

---

[6] Cooper, J. M., *Religion Outlines for Colleges*, Course IV, pp. 138–139.

Again, since the protective functions have been so largely taken over by the modern State, the bond of protection no longer serves to integrate the family group as it did in the past. Moreover, the taking over of many educational functions by the school has weakened the education bond of an earlier day. And, finally, there is the mental bond. It has suffered also. The homogeneous family complex of the Middle Ages has been notably weakened and disturbed. The many like attitudes that made for an identification and concensus of the family members, have been variously affected in the tense life of our modern culture and in our disturbed religious situation, and have given place to many dissimilar attitudes and much consequent incompatibility. This has given rise to many conflicting situations that disturb the family complex and break down the consciousness and harmonious coöperation of the familial group. Some family tensions there have always been as a source of disturbance to the harmonious unison of familial love. But to-day they have greatly increased and have become a source of much domestic disorganization and disintegration.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. Can you mention any further forms of arrested family life?
2. Is there any foundation for an over-population scare?
3. What is the Church's solution for the population problem?
4. Among what particular groups does the birth-rate seem lowest?
5. Show the social importance of the virtue of chastity as taught by Christianity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bruehl, C., *Birth-Control and Eugenics.*
Cooper, J. M., "Birth-Control." (*N. C. W. C. Publication.*)

DUDLEY, O. F., *The Masterful Monk.*

————, *Will Men Be Like Gods?*

FLETCHER, M., *The Christian Family,* Ch. VIII.

FOERSTER, F. W., *Marriage and the Sex Problem.*

GROVES, E. R., *Social Problems of the Family,* Ch. VI.

MEYER, O. F. M., F., *Plain Talks on Marriage,* Chs. IV, V, VI.

NEWSHOLME, A., *The Elements of Vital Statistics,* Ch. IX.

POPENOE, P., *The Conservation of the Family,* Part II.

————, "Family or Companionate," *Jour. of Soc. Hygiene,* Vol. XI, No. 3.

RYAN, J. A., "Open Letter to Birth-Control League," *Catholic Mind,* June 22, 1915.

THOMPSON, W. S., *The Size of Families from Which College Students Come.*

————, *Population; A Study of Malthusianism.*

————, "Race Suicide in the United States," *Amer. Jour. of Physical Anthropology,* Vol. III, pp. 97–146.

CHAPTER XII

FAMILY TENSIONS

Family tensions are typical sources of domestic discord—conflict situations that naturally tend to disturb the family pattern and break down the family complex. Tensions are usually founded in difference of attitude between individuals in a group. The attitudes of an individual greatly affect his conduct. Just as an identification or similarity of attitudes naturally serves to unite and integrate the members of groups, so a differentiation or dissimilarity of attitudes readily tends toward disunion and group disintegration. When, therefore, the attitudes of the husband and wife come to differ fundamentally, one may normally expect some lack of agreement also in their behavior. The fact is that such differences of attitudes often lead to open disagreement and outright conflict between the pair.

To some extent such conflict situations were found in the homes of the past, and at the present time no family can expect to escape their influence entirely. In fact, to-day, family tensions have grown in number and intensity, and are also working greater havoc in family life than was the case even in the fairly recent past. In some homes, it is true, they are quite rare. In others, they may occur with considerable intensity but speedily pass into oblivion again. It is in the homes in which they become chronic that family tensions do most damage. If a family is already weak because of a weakening of its various bonds, the tension situation will likely hasten its dissolution. But, if otherwise strong and vital, the tension will likely be nipped in the bud and leave little or no harmful effect on the domestic group.

Classification of Tensions.—Various kinds of tensions can be distinguished. Several attempts have been made to group all of them together as type situations in order to serve as guides in the analysis and diagnosis of cases of domestic discord and in the reconstruction of disorganized families. Since the matter of clasification is in great part arbitrary, the situations included in the different classifications naturally differ.

Perhaps the most elaborate classification has been worked out by Merony.[1] He distinguishes four main types and many sub-factors, as follows:

I. Economic Factors
  (1) Poverty
  (2) Financial Reverse
  (3) Economic Independence of Wife
  (4) Occupational Conditions
    (a) Employment of Both Husband and Wife
    (b) Mobility of Occupation
    (c) Stability of Occupation
    (d) Occupational Standards
    (e) Sex Contacts Required by Occupation
II. Health Factors.
  (1) Sickness and Disease
  (2) Physical Deformity
  (3) Physiological Changes Due to Age
  (4) Psycopathic Conditions
III. Personal Factors
  (1) Temperament
  (2) Appetites and Habits
  (3) Sex Attitudes
  (4) Age Variance
  (5) Philosophy of Life
  (6) Personal Behavior Patterns
IV. Social Factors
  (1) Race
  (2) Social Class
  (3) Religion
  (4) Status
  (5) Child-Complexes
  (6) Social Control of the Family Group
  (7) Relatives

---

[1] Merony, *The Town Church and the Modern Family*, p. 77.

It is readily apparent that, even in this elaborate classification, with its multiplication of subdivisions, some of the factors are broad in scope and overlap with others.

A more recent classification[2] includes thirteen type tensions. It is perhaps more concrete than the former one and escapes over-simplification. The divisions are:

(1) Economic
(2) Occupation
(3) Response (Sex)
(4) Control (Positional Relationship of Members to Each Other)
(5) Status (Positional Relationship of Family in Social Participation)
(6) Culture
(7) Philosophy of Life
(8) Temperament
(9) Health
(10) Individual Capacities and Abilities
(11) Appetites and Habits
(12) Personal Behavior Pattern
(13) Age

The meaning of the different terms seems obvious. They are chosen to designate the various casual factors at work in creating tension situations. Commonly, as will be indicated later, these tensions do not operate in isolation but in sets. It is but rare that a case of family disorganization can be charged entirely to one single cause. Nevertheless, there is usually in each case of family disorganization one type situation that is predominant in the conflict between family members. These dominant tensions might well be termed primary, to distinguish them from the minor or subsidiary ones which could with equal propriety be called secondary.

It would take one too far afield to go into detail here. Suffice giving some attention to a limited number of the chief types of tensions that constantly recur, either as dominant or contributory factors, in modern disorganized families.

---

[2] Krueger, E. T., "A Study of Marriage Incompatibility" *The Family*, April, 1925, p. 53.

These may serve as examples of other conflict situations that might well be included if space allowed.

Cultural Tensions.—The term "culture" is very broad, including religious, educational, racial, recreational, and other folkways and *mores* of a people. Culture shapes a person's life-pattern. It affects his personality and his entire outlook upon life. It determines the attitude or bias with which he approaches any problem or life situation. Where the culture and life-patterns of husband and wife are similar, there is a good basis for harmony in their family relations. Fundamental dissimilarity in culture, on the other hand, will only too readily lead to discord and division.

Cultural differentiation naturally has its source in the diversity of culture to which husband and wife have been subject in their past life. Normally, there will be at least some difference in culture between educated and uneducated, between rich and poor, between native and foreign-born, between city and country-bred, between members of different religious cults, and between individuals of different races. These differences will make themselves felt in the *mores,* folkways, aims, attitudes, ideals, and tastes of a people. They not only keep the two parties to the marriage contract from becoming fused into a normally organized family group, but also frequently lead to outright conflict or tensions in their home life.

Thus, the millionaire's daughter who marries the chauffeur can have very little in common with him. The interests of the two, their associates, their leisure-time activities, and the like, will all naturally be of a different order, and it will not be a simple task to make the interests of the one individual appeal to the other. Again, Jew and Gentile, or white and black, normally would find many dissimilarities constantly threatening to come between them and to disturb their domestic peace. Immigration to this country has resulted in a considerable amount of intermarriage between members of strikingly different races and frequently the effect was much domestic disharmony and disunion. Or, again, there are religious differences that tend to pit husband and wife against each other. And so one might go on multiplying instances in which culture, up-bringing, or general social background leads to much familial tension and even to ultimate disintegration of home-life.

Family tensions based upon cultural differentiation are not uncommon in this country, the meeting-ground of people of so many different cultural backgrounds. While frequently these tensions lead to a breakdown of common interest and of sympathetic relations between husband and wife, they do not necessarily lead to total familial disorganization. Seldom is any such family free from tensions peculiar to difference in culture. Hence, it is with good sense that like marries like, for ordinarily compatibility of mates is based upon similarities existing between them, while incompatibilities or tensions result from differences or dissimilarities. This is true in the case of cultural as well as in other tensions.

The Streit Case.—The following is a case of cultural differentiation in which a considerable amount of tension developed between the husband and wife, but did not bring about the disruption of the home. The two had many interests in common. They were both of German parentage, but American born. Both also came from fairly well-to-do families in the same general community. They professed the same creed, both faithfully practising the Catholic religion. Yet, there were differences too, and these somewhat marred their home-life and led to no small amount of disagreement and unhappiness. The differences were due to diversity of culture, to dissimilarity in training and in general social background.

Clement Streit was the son of a wealthy farmer. In spite of his wealth, however, the elder Streit did not give his children much educational opportunity. He thought the better method in caring for the future of his children was to invest his money in more and more land in order that he might give each a farm at the time of marriage. As a result, Clement's education was limited to what was offered in the local country grade-school. Moreover, aside from the year and a half that he had spent in the army during the World War, Clement had never left his rural environment for any length of time. His whole up-bringing was rural.

Helen, his fiancee, was the daughter of a banker in the nearest town. Her educational opportunities had been noticeably superior to those of Clement. After finishing the grade-school she for six years attended a Catholic boarding school for girls in a large city. There she received a liberal education and, particularly, gave much of her time and attention to music. She grew up a refined and accomplished young woman, quite different because of her entire training and cultural background from Clement, her future husband.

Returning from service overseas with a war cross, his local community had made much ado over Clement Streit. This acclaim and glamor helped to make him a veritable Prince Charming to Helen. Clement, on his part, was not slow in seizing the opportunity of giving his attention to the daughter of one of the leading families of the vicinity. The two were married after a very brief courtship. Naturally, as they settled down to the normal grind of everyday life the glamor of courtship days gradually wore off and the glory of war heroes ceased to be sung. It was only then that the rather striking dissimilarities between the two began to put in their appearance.

The two made their home on a farm which Clement's father had given him. Farm life was something new to Helen, yet she made no objection to it and seemed quite content. Her many friends and relatives frequently visited at the home, and Helen was always eager to have them come. Such visits served to break the isolation of the rural life. Yet it was precisely this fact that soon precipitated difficulties in the Streit home. While alone with her husband, Helen had paid little attention to his poor English and peculiar mannerisms, to his lack of etiquette and rather blatant spirit of braggadocio. But when guests were present it was different. She then felt all these defects very keenly, and especially so when some of the guests showed that they noticed his oddities and his utter lack of respect for the social conventions and properties. Helen tried in vain to correct him and to show him her point of view. But Clement did not seem to be able to grasp the situation. He looked upon the whole matter as a bit of inconsequential foolishness. Yet he felt that many of his unconscious acts deeply wounded his wife's feelings.

The crisis came at table one day when Clement became so enthusiastic in relating his former military exploits to a large group of guests that he entirely neglected his own meal until all the others had finished; then he kept them waiting while he leisurely finished. To the sensitive and refined Helen his conduct was mortifying. Once during the meal she had nudged her husband with her elbow, hoping he might take the hint. But she was only embarrassed the more when he bluntly asked ''What's the matter?'' in a manner that assured all present that something indeed was the matter. When the guests were gone Helen vehemently chided her husband for what he had done.

It was the first time she had really shown any bitterness toward him. The husband realized that he had again unconsciously embarrassed his wife; but it was beyond him to see through the reason for all her grief. From that day on they became more and more self-conscious and their relations with each other more strained. Yet the promptings of their religious sense of duty and obligation toward each other kept down quite well all bickering and outward conflict in the home. The arrival of their first child brought husband and wife closer together again and put new zest and interest into their life. While there is no question of total disruption of the family, the group is not thoroughly organized, and sources of further tension situations remain.

Religious Tensions.—Special mention may well be made of family discord that results from mixed marriages in this country, the land of many different religions. As was pointed out before, religion was ever an essential bond of family life in the past. So also today, when husband and wife profess the same faith and when religion really plays an active part in their individual lives, it undoubtedly does much to establish a vital family group. On the other hand, when there is dissimilarity of religion, not only is integration and agreement lacking but outright disagreement and consequent disintegration frequently results.

This is one of the reasons why the Catholic Church has from earliest times forbidden the marriage of Catholics with Non-Catholics. Her age-old experience has taught her time and again that, not only do such marriages in many instances result in loss of faith on the part of the contracting parties and their children, but also that peace and contentment in their homes can not reasonably be expected, that conflict and tension situations are almost inevitable. Fifteen centuries ago St. Ambrose expressed this thought when he said: "Where there is discord in faith, how can there be accord in charity?" Moreover, it is not uncommon today to find non-Catholic writers on the family taking the same attitude. Thus Popenoe, writing merely from the viewpoint of one interested in wholesale family life, states, "Compatibility includes similarity in religion, if the two persons have strong convictions on that subject." Factual studies also show that it is particularly in this realm of religion that the saying holds true, "United we stand, divided we fall."

And this is but to be expected. Of all differences there are none more serious, none more stubborn and disastrous in their results than differences of a religious character. Religion deals with the most fundamental attitudes of life, and where there are differences in fundamentals, discord is usually not far distant. Hence, even when husband and wife agree on all other subjects, how can there be real union as long as there is lack of agreement, if not outright disagreement, regarding the most important question of life, namely, religion?

There are many different ways in which tension situations may develop over differences in religion. Hostility may easily arise in the home over such practices as Friday abstinence from meat, over the baptism or Catholic education of children, over the practice of confession, or over such matters of morals as family limitation. At times the constant wrangling may end in one party yielding or compromising in matters of serious importance, thus causing much unhappiness because of the betrayal of conscience involved. Again, it may happen that the husband, for instance, becomes a veritable enemy of his wife's religion, ridiculing it, forbidding its practice within or outside the home. Particularly does the one party become a stranger to all happiness when the other, who perhaps before marriage restrained the tongue, gives expression to unbelief and has learned the secret of inflicting torture by irreverent words or blasphemous aspersions regarding those persons, places, or things that the other holds sacred. Wherever religious difference obtains between the two chief home-makers, their home usually becomes a house divided against itself.

Even when difference in religious belief and practice does not lead to disagreement and disunion, it prevents a genuine organization of home-life. No matter how well disposed towards each other husband and wife may be, the fact remains that one treads one path, the other another. The pair remain as before marriage, not one but two. There is no real union of hearts nor full harmony of sentiments, because there is no common faith. With no community of feeling between them with regard to what should be the chief sentiment of life, love itself is naturally cooled. The situation is well expressed by the remark of a recent Catholic convert who had spent twenty-eight years in a mixed-marriage relationship: "The difference of religion is like an invisible wall separating husband and wife at the most intimate and solemn moments of life. . . . There is a dark cloud hovering over the family circle always, and at times one can almost feel it, so heavily does it weigh upon all.''

The Words Case.—Mr. and Mrs. Words came from the same social class and there were many similarities and common interests between them that boded well for their future married life. But there was also one notable source of disagreement between them. There was difference of religion. Mr. Words was a Catholic. Mrs. Words professed no particular religious belief. She occasionally attended church but had no positive religious convictions of any particular kind. She was an indifferentist. With her, one religion was as good as another.

After the marriage Mrs. Words at times accompanied her husband to his church. Matters went on smoothly during the first year of their married life. It is true she had shown some displeasure over the matter of preparing ''fish'' meals required by the laws of her husband's Church. No real conflict developed out of this, however, since the husband usually took his noon-day meal down town and his wife could then prepare what she pleased for herself. But with the arrival of the first child, more serious trouble began in the home. Mrs. Words was of the opinion that the child should be allowed to grow up and deliberately choose his own religion. Mr. Words and his mother insisted upon the baptism of the child in the father's religion. When this program was carried out over the wife's protest, she became very resentful, particularly because of what she considered the ''uncalled-for interference of the mother-in-law.'' And she retaliated with the ultimatum that, if the grandmother was to have more power over the child than the mother then there were to be no more children in her home. That situation meant a difference in moral standards between husband and wife and it led to much antagonism between them. She had her way for five years, at which time their child was killed by an automobile. At first the mother was almost frantic with grief; then she gradually settled down into a spirit of moodiness and dissatisfaction. At not infrequent intervals the husband became the butt of her discontent. Incensed at her constant bickering and bad spirit, the latter one day remarked that she had but herself to blame for her troubles; that if she had raised a family she would have something to interest herself in besides her selfish self. It was the last straw. She left the house in a rage and never returned. A year later she married again. Mr. Words, in accordance with the laws of his Church, has not remarried.

Sex Incompatibility.—In the recent literature on the family the conflict or discord that arises out of the marital relations, or the physical element of love, is commonly referred to as incompatability of response or sexual incompatability. Differences of attitude in this matter are quite common and lead to no small amount of tension in modern family life.

Sex incompatibility has its origin in a number of different circumstances. First of all, there is the difference in the sexual natures of men and women. This readily leads to incompatibility, particularly when there is ignorance of this difference on the part of husband and wife. And, there is as a matter of fact much ignorance of this difference on the part of men and women. Referring to these marked differences between the sexes in the mating impulses, Dr. Cooper writes: "Newly married couples particularly need to bear in mind the great differences that commonly exist between the sexes in the matter of the physical and psychical elements. Their sex natures differ, more often very fundamentally. The larger part the physical element plays in the man's nature may—unless he be on his guard to show the most tender and considerate thoughtfulness for his mate, and unless he make clear in every possible way that over and above the physical urge there is real love and self-devotion—repel her and make her think he is merely looking upon her as a means of satisfying passion. He needs to recall that what nature urges upon him may be to her indifferent, or repulsive, or even physically painful. On the other hand, the larger part that the psychical elements play in the woman's nature may lead him to think her cold, unresponsive, and lacking in affection."[3] And this difference may well be borne in mind and given due consideration, not only in the case of newly wedded couples but of all the married.

Moreover, it is worthy of note, that not only is there a difference in the sexual attitudes of the two sexes, but also in the case of individuals of one and the same sex, and even among individuals of different cultural groups. The diversities may be due to physiological, to temperamental, or even to cultural differences. But, whatever their immediate source, these differences in their natures and attitudes may readily lead to clashes between husband and wife, to conflict situations that tend to weaken the most fundamental bond of the family,—affection.

Another rather prominent source of incompatibility in response to-day is the presence of social disease in either mate. This affliction has become common, especially in the modern city, and the victimized partner is much more likely to realize the source of his or her sickness to-day than was the case but a few decades ago. The two more common venereal diseases carry with them extremely grave consequences in married life. And a growing realization of the origin of both these diseases and their consequences has led to increasing conflict and tension in the homes in which they have put in their appearance.

A number of other circumstances also tend to cause incompatibility of response. Perversions, for instance, are especially offensive to the average marital partner, particularly to a finer-grained spouse. Sickness is frequently the origin of physiological differences and thus the cause of irritation and incompatibility. Refusal of the marriage right because of sickness, fear of pregnancy, or other motive, is another source of marital conflict. Interference with established habits of marital relations for various possible reasons also helps to swell the streams of familial discord. Infidelity, or even suspicion thereof, is, too, unquestionably a considerable modern factor.

---

[3] Cooper, J. M., *Religion Outlines for Colleges*, Course IV, pp. 129–130.

Beyond any doubt, this type of family tension is a very fruitful source of domestic disharmony today. Some social-workers have come to consider the sex factor as the most common of all causes of family discord, though this particular source of trouble is frequently avoided in the records. Very generally it is considered one of the dominant causes of the undermining of genuine affection and mutuality of spirit in family life. While the tension situations created disorganize the home, they do not necessarily lead to disintegration of the group. Thus Mowrer gives the example of one hundred cases of family disorganization carefully analyzed, in which 40 per cent represented incompatibility in response. And he adds: "Whether or not any type tension culminates in disintegration, depends upon the dominant interest of the persons and their ability to dissociate one type interest from another. If the dissatisfied person is willing to forego the satisfaction of one group of desires for another group, or if there is sufficent dissociation of interests to allow the relationship to continue upon the basis of certain interests without the others, family disintegration does not materialize."[4]

One can readily understand how, for instance, a sense of duty, the good of children, desire for security, and similar reasons, might induce one to continue the family relationship in spite of sexual or other incompatibility. In fact, a recent study by a referee in a domestic relations court shows sex incompatibility playing a part in 480 of 500 cases referred to the court. In none of the cases was the marriage dissolved. But there was disorganization because of the presence of the tension.[5]

Economic Tensions.—An economic tension is a situation in which the economic factor is the source of conflicting attitudes. It is very generally recognized today as the cause of much family discord and disunion. It is more commonly found in the masses of the lower and middle classes where the pinch of poverty is readily felt, or where financial security is easily threatened, than in the upper classes where sufficient resources are available for every need.

---

[4] Mowrer, E. R., *Family Disorganization*, p. 204.

[5] An interesting case is recorded in detail and analyzed by Mowrer, in which this particular type of tension stands out rather prominently. Cf. Mowrer, E. R., *Family Disorganization*, Chs. XI, XII.

Economic tension between husband and wife may arise in a myriad different ways, particularly in modern urban life. Sheer poverty, for instance, may be the root of the family discord. Again, there is the question of the management of the financial matters of the home, or the disposition of the family funds. There are cases too in which the need of changing standards of living to a lower plane necessitates a changing of habits to which the parties have become accustomed, and that may cause much irritation. The change may be from standards attained either before or after marriage. Then also, differences in training with regard to money matters will likely mean different attitudes in this important matter, and, as in cases of any other difference in attitudes conflict will be very readily provoked thereby. The question whether the wife should work for monetary consideration outside the home may also become a source of family tension. Again, spendthrift habits on the part of either husband or wife, inability to handle money efficiently, and failure to support the family adequately, may also contribute a share to the volume of discordant family life. More frequently on the part of the housewife, there may be difficulty, and even impossibility, of distributing the income in a manner that seems meet and just to both husband and wife. One might, in fact, go on almost indefinitely enumerating the potential causes of conflict, growing out of the economic element of life alone.

Frequently, even apparently insignificant financial matters may lead to serious familial disagreement between husband and wife. One might even safely say that there is some element of economic individualization in every marriage. Yet, it does not always lead to friction in the home, though in many cases indeed does it do so today. Those who are acquainted with the causes of familial disputes and disagreements are quite at one in maintaining that the economic side of family life ranks very high among the factors that cause family tensions, and frequently, even subsequent disruption of the domestic kingdom. In this case, too, the real cause often does not appear in the records of agencies, because the parties, on account of a sense of shame, withhold the true causes of their trouble.[6]

Tension Constellations.—Many other type tensions besides the above might well be added if space allowed. One other source of domestic discord is the change in the positional status of wife and husband in the home, as treated in an earlier chapter. Yet it may well be pointed out that it is but seldom that one particular tension becomes the cause of a family difficulty. The one more immediate cause usually spreads to other fields and gradually poisons the entire family relationship. Thus, for instance, while the economic factor may be the dominant cause of family turmoil, usually subsidiary tensions as occupation, social status, and the like, also put in their appearance and contribute to the sum total of the domestic difficulty. Often some tension factor may reach back to long-forgotten troubles of the past, unearthing them anew. Not only are new wounds made but old ones are opened again. It is particularly this fact of a constellation of tensions at work in cases of family trouble that makes the analysis and control of such a family situation so difficult after it has been allowed to develop.

FAMILY DISORGANIZATION

Increased tensions in modern family life have meant increased family disorganization. Some tension situations, it is true, arise in all families, but in many instances they are quite harmless. Such is particularly the case if their growth and development is prevented. It is especially in the case of chronic discord that family disorganization, and, at times, even total disintegration, results. Such disorganization involves individualization of behavior in family relations. Just as organization implies an identification of attitudes and behavior in family life, so disorganization involves differentiation of interests and aims of family members. The former builds up the family complex; the latter breaks it down. The one strengthens the mental bond; the other weakens it.

---

[6] An interesting case of economic tension in a family, taken from actual life and carefully analyzed, is recorded in the April, 1928 issue of *The Family*, p. 55. Another, the Conroy Case, more fictitious apparently, can be found in the *Survey Graphic*, Dec. 1, 1927, p. 288.

Individualism Fundamental in Family Disorganization.—Analyzing a disorganized family situation will invariably show the individualistic principle at work. The wishes of the individual members definitely take precedence over the wishes of the family group. This point is well-made in Thomas' and Znaniecki's *Polish Peasant in Europe and America,* in which they speak of I-attitudes replacing We-attitudes in the group.

"The real cause of the phenomenon of family disorganization is to be sought in the influence of certain new values—new for the subject—such as: new sources of hedonistic satisfaction, new vanity values, new (individualistic) types of economic organization, new forms of sexual appeal. This influence supposes, of course, not only a contact between the individual and the outside world but also the existence in the individual's personality of certain attitudes which make him respond to these new values—hedonistic aspirations, desire for social recognition, desire for economic security and advance, sexual instincts. The specific phenomenon of family disorganization consists in a definite modification of those pre-existing attitudes under the influence of new values, resulting in the appearance of new, more or less different attitudes. The nature of this modification can be generally characterized in such a way that, while the attitudes which existed under the family system were essentially 'we' attitudes (the individual does not dissociate his hedonistic tendencies, his desires for recognition or economic security, his sexual needs from the tendencies and aspirations of his family group), the new attitudes produced by the new values acting upon those attitudes are essentially 'I' attitudes—the individual's wishes are separated in his consciousness from those of other members of his family. Such an evolution implies that the new values with which the individual gets in touch are individualistic in their meaning, appeal to the individual, not to the group as a whole.''[7]

As a result of individualism, therefore, the common objectives disappear and individual aims are substituted; coöperation ceases between the family members; mutual services are withheld from each other; the roles of the members are no longer coördinated and defined; emotional attitudes become indifferent or even antagonistic. There is nothing in such a situation to foster love. There is much to hurt it. And with all family bonds weakened in many families today, it is not surprising that frequently disorganization ends in total disintegration or the dissolution of the family group. With mental solidarity, cultural unity, and emotional harmony disturbed, there is less sympathetic radiation, social suggestion, and imitation in the family group. And as a result the group is no longer so closely integrated as in the past.

The Extent of Family Disorganization.—Modern life has greatly increased the amount of tension in family life. Life outside the home, particularly in the cities, has become very involved and complex. Nerves are at high tension much of the time. Hence difficulties and differences that occur within the home very easily cause an explosion. Since life runs at such high pressure outside the home, some naturally expect the home to be more a relief station and haven of rest than was the case formerly. And disappointment is expressed if the enlarged demands are not met. Thus there are forces at work within and outside the home that may promote family disorganization.

While it is evident that, because of the new situation, family

[7] Thomas, W. I., and Zwaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, Vol. IV, pp. 41–42.

disorganization has greatly increased in the modern family, it is quite impossible to find with any degree of accuracy the precise extent of disorganization of family life. Divorce and desertion statistics, for instance, may help to some extent. These, however, are but forms of family decay and may be taken to indicate the completion of the process of family disorganization. They represent the culmination of the series of events that led to the breakdown and discontinuance of the family relationship. In fact, divorce and desertion are but the external recognition that a family has no longer any existence in the attitudes of husband and wife—that the interests and aims of each have become completely differentiated. Hence, these statistics tell nothing whatever of the many cases of partial disintegration, of the concealed tensions and subdued quarrels between husband and wife in cases in which these do not eventuate in separation, desertion, or divorce. Still, even these limited means of gauging the extent of disorganization of the modern family put before us a rather startling picture. In the following chapter attention will be given to the increasing number of broken homes and to some of the main effects of both partially and totally disorganized family life of today.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. How would you classify family tensions?
2. Give a case of economic incompatibility in a family.
3. Is lack of housekeeping ability a considerable cause of family tension?
4. What personality defects are likely to lead to domestic discord?
5. Do men or women cause most tension situations in the home?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cooper, J. M., *Religion Outlines for Colleges,* Course IV, Ch. IX.
Deardorf, N. R., "A Puzzle in Cross Words," *Survey Graphic,* Dec., 1927.
Flügel, J. C., *The Psycho-Analytic Study of the Family.*
Groves, E. R., *The Drifting Home,* Ch. VII.
——————, *Personality and Social Adjustment,* Ch. XII.
Keyserling, H., *The Book of Marriage.*

Krueger, E. T., "A Study of Marriage Incompatibility," *The Family,* April, 1925.
McChristie, M. E., "Marriages at the Breaking Point," *Survey Graphic,* Dec., 1927.
Merony, "The Country Church and Modern Family." (*Thesis,* Chicago University.)
Mowrer, E., *Family Disorganization.*
———————, *Domestic Discord.*
———————, "City Life and Domestic Discord," *Survey Graphic,* Vol. LVII, No. 5.
Warner, F. L., "Love's Minor Frictions," *Atlantic Monthly,* Dec., 1920.

CHAPTER XIII

BROKEN HOMES

The weakening of family bonds and the growth of tensions within the home suggest an increase in domestic disintegration in recent years. Current opinion and statistical studies also bear this out. Divorce, for instance has grown not only in this country but also in other parts of the world. In fact, its increase may be said to be world-wide. Naturally, this decay has involved a crippling of family functions and a hampering of its purposes in multiple ways. Both the individual parties to the marriage contract, and the children born of the union, have suffered greatly in many instances. Some have been injured for life.

DIVORCE

Of the various kinds of total family disorganization, divorce holds the center of public interest. Statistical studies have been largely limited to this field, far less attention being given to such forms of the disrupted family as desertion, separation, annulment, and death.

Extent of Divorce in European Countries.—While the divorce rate for the United States is the highest in the world, it has also increased considerably in other countries, particularly since the World War. In the year 1922, for example, the following numbers of divorces per 100,000 population were given for various European countries: France 71; Germany 58; Switzerland 54; Belgium 49; Denmark 39; Netherlands 28; Sweden 24; Norway 21. The number for Japan was 92 per

100,000 population the same year, and that of the United States 136.[1]

Extent in the United States.—The foregoing figures should help us the better to grasp our own unenviable record in this country. It is literally true that there are more divorces granted in this country than in all the rest of the world together. "So common is it (divorce)," says Dr. D. I. Dublin, speaking at a Race Betterment Conference (at Battle Creek), "it is now a major social problem in our social economy, and the evil is rapidly getting out of hand." "In certain social classes," he adds, "it has become the fashion."

The actual number of divorces in the United States for the year 1927—the last year reported by the Federal Government—was 192,037. This refers only to final decrees and does not include applications for divorce or the cases in which the final decree did not become effective until after the close of the year. In the same year there were 1,201,053 marriages. In other words, there was one divorce for every 6.2 marriages contracted.[2]

The History of Divorce in the United States.—Divorce was found to some extent in this country in its earliest days and the wedge, once inserted, has constantly been driven deeper and deeper, until today it is splitting asunder the innermost fiber of the home and of society. Its history in this country has been one of constant increase, and there is no evidence of decline. In fact, with the rapid cultural changes now under way, quite the contrary may well be expected, unless some powerful forces are brought to bear to stop it.

There have always been, as there are to-day, sectional differences with regard to divorce. In the colonial period the New England colonies were the most liberal with regard to divorce.

---

[1] Mowrer, E. R., *Family Disorganization*, p. 33.

[2] The United States Government has made nine investigations regarding marriage and divorce. The first covered the 20-year period, 1867–1886; the second, the 20-year period, 1887–1906. The other reports were for the individual calendar years, 1916, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927. The statistics for this country in this chapter will be based upon these government reports unless otherwise indicated.

In harmony with Protestant principle, marriage was there robbed of its sacramental character and considered a mere civil contract. The right to divorce was but a logical deduction. The Southern colonies, influenced by the teachings of the Church of England, did not recognize absolute divorce. The Middle colonies, seemingly influenced somewhat by both other groups, took a middle course, more liberal than that of the Southern colonies and more conservative than that of the New England group. A sharp rise in the divorce rate began with the latter half of the nineteenth-century and continued down to the present time. It has apparently grown apace with the Industrial Revolution. And to this day, too, there have been noticeable differences in the extent of divorce in different parts of the United States.[3]

Recent Increases in Divorce.—The number of divorces reported for each of the years covered by the federal investigations shows a persistent, though irregular, increase in the number of divorces granted in this country. Thus, for instance, in 1887 there were 27,919 divorces granted in the United States; in 1900, 55,751; in 1916, 112,036; in 1926, 180,868. It is true, there was also a constant increase in population throughout these years. Still, the latter increase was not as large as was that of the divorce rate. Thus, in 1870 there were 10,962 divorces granted, while in 1926 there were 180,868, an increase of about 17 per cent. The population in 1870 was 38.5 millions, while the estimate for 1926 was 117 millions, that is, only about three times as many. Hence, the divorce rate has increased much more rapidly than the population during this period. The ratio, namely, stands 17 to 3.

Perhaps the best way of showing the increase of divorce is to cite the number of divorces per 1,000 married persons. The statistics show that from 1870 to 1880 the divorce rate per 1,000 married persons increased 32 per cent; from 1880 to 1890, about 35 per cent; from 1890 to 1900, about 35 per cent;

---

[3] Goodsell, W., *The Family as a Social and Educational Institution,* pp. 380–381.

for the ten-year period 1906 to 1916 the rate of increase was not quite so large, namely, 21 per cent; but in the following period, 1916 to 1926, it again rose to 33 per cent.

European countries also show a constant increase. Thus in France they increased 100 per cent between the years 1900 and 1913; in Germany they increased 75 per cent between 1900 and 1914.[4]

Differences in Urban and Rural Areas.—As in the past there were sectional differences in the number of divorces, so, too, to-day the rate is far from uniform throughout the country. First of all there is a difference in urban and in rural parts, the rate running higher in the former than in the latter areas. This is shown by tables prepared by the Federal Census Office. They are based on a study of 28 States and the District of Columbia. The divorce records by county were either lacking or incomplete in the States not included. Comparison was made between the divorce rate for city counties and other counties. In all but three of the States in the table the divorce rate in 1900 was greater in the city counties than in other counties. The three exceptions were New York, Pennsylvania, and Oregon. In New Jersey, Connecticut, and Michigan, the excess in the city counties was comparatively slight, but in the remaining 22 States it was considerable, varying from 10 in Louisiana to 166 in Iowa. As a broad general statement, therefore, it may be safely said that the divorce rate in the cities of at least 100,000 inhabitants is greater than it is in small cities and in country districts. Then, too, the proportion of married persons in the adult population is somewhat lower in urban populations. Hence, the rate is not only absolutely higher, but relatively higher still. There is the further consideration that Catholics gather largely in cities.

The Bureau of Census Report on marriage and divorce also shows the urban divorce rate to be higher than the rural by comparing the number of divorces in certain States with the number in certain large cities where the city is approximately coterminous with the county. Thus, Cook County, Illinois, in which the city of Chicago is situated, had 48.8 per cent of the population of the State, but 59.8 per cent of the divorces. In California, San Francisco had 14 per cent of the population of the State, 12.3 per cent of the marriages and 19.8 per cent of the divorces. In all likelihood the difference would be still greater if the figure for the State at large had included only the divorces from the strictly rural parts, exclusive of towns and villages. Undoubtedly, the chief factor at work here is the Industrial Revolution, so much more advanced in the city than in the country. Still, there are other factors accounting for the different rates in the two areas.

---

[4] Cooper, J. M., *Religion Outlines for Colleges.*

Differences by Geographic Areas.—Differences between the various sections of the country in divorce rates have long been quite marked. In 1927 the rate per 1,000 of the married population ranged from 1.57 in the Middle Atlantic division to 7.16 in the Pacific division, making a rate considerably over four times as high in the Pacific as in the Atlantic division. In fact, the contrast is quite striking between the Middle Atlantic, the New England, and the South Atlantic groups, with 1.57, 2.34, 2.53 per cent respectively, and the Pacific, the Mountain, and the West South Central groups, with 7.16, 6.32, and 6.80 per cent, respectively, per 1,000 married population. This leaves the other three groups, the East North Central, the West North Central, and the East South Central, a middle position with a rate of 4.79, 4.36 and 4.41 per cent respectively, per 1,000 married population.

In general, the farther west one proceeds, the higher the divorce rate one finds. Undoubtedly, a very real factor in this is the more liberal democratic and even extremely individualistic spirit that developed simultaneously with the opening up and growth of the West.

Divorce Rates by States.—Even a greater variation is seen in the rates by States than by geographic areas. South Carolina has no divorce, all laws permitting it having been repealed in 1878. Aside from this State and the District of Columbia, which is in effect a municipality, the rate per 1,000 of the married population ranged from 1.05 in New York to 63 in Nevada in 1927. The previous year, 1926 the rate for these two States was, New York 0.99, and Nevada, 32.73. Besides New York, the chances for divorce are fairly low in such States as New Jersey, North Carolina and Georgia. At the other extreme, with Nevada, are found such States as Oregon, Texas, and Oklahoma. Not only did the number of divorces in 1927 as compared with 1926 increase in the entire United States and each of the nine geographic divisions, but also in 39 of the 48 States and in the District of Columbia. The individual increase was exceptionally large in the eight States—Connecticut, New Jersey, South Dakota, Nebraska, Texas, New Mexico, Nevada and California. On the other hand, the number of divorces decreased in eight States. The decrease was large in Vermont, where a new law became effective June 1, 1927, by which divorces do not become final until six months after the granting of the decree. In Virginia divorces neither increased nor decreased.

The Federal Report for 1922 gave the differences between States in considerable detail and also the probable causes thereof. ''The divorce rates per State show wider variations than do those for geographic divisions. The number of divorces per 100,000 total population varied, in 1922, from 37 in the District of Columbia and 39 in New York to 1,325 in Nevada, while in 1916 the variation was from 12 in the District of Columbia and 30 in North Carolina to 820 in Nevada. Similarly, the number of divorces per 100,000 married population varied, in 1922, from 85 in the District of Columbia and 92 in New York to 3,289 in Nevada, and in 1916 from 29 in the District of Columbia and 81 in New York to 2,008 in Nevada. The population to one divorce ranged, in 1922, from 2,718 in the District of Columbia and 2,589 in New York to 75 in Nevada, while in 1916 the range was from 8,493 in the District of Columbia and 3,284 in North Carolina to 122 in Nevada. There was, likewise, a wide range in the married population to one divorce—from 1,177 in the District of Columbia and

1,087 in New York to 30 in Nevada in 1922, and from 3,411 in the District of Columbia and 1,236 in New York to 50 in Nevada in 1916. It will be noted that in the case of each rate the District of Columbia was lowest and Nevada highest, with New York next lowest as to the number per 100,000 married population and as to married population to 1 divorce, and with North Carolina next lowest as to number of divorces per 100,000 population and as to population to 1 divorce.

''The very striking difference noted between the divorce rate in New York and that in Nevada, is doubtless explained largely by the difference in the divorce laws, and by the difference in the extent to which persons migrate to or from these places for the purpose of securing divorces. In 1927 absolute divorce could be granted in New York for adultery only, whereas in Nevada absolute divorce could be granted for any one of eight causes—impotency, adultery, desertion, conviction of felony or infamous crime, habitual drunkenness, extreme cruelty, neglect of husband to provide, and insanity. In New York, to maintain action for divorce, both parties must have been residents of the State when the offense was committed; or must have been married within the State; or the plaintiff must have been a resident when the offense was committed in the State, the plaintiff must have been a resident when the action was commenced. In Nevada, however, only three months' residence was necessary before bringing suit for divorce for a cause occurring outside the county. In New York, a decree did not become final until three months after entry of interlocutory judgment; and then the defendant could not marry again during the lifetime of the complainant unless the court modified the judgment after three years on the proof of good conduct. In Nevada, on the other hand, the decree was prompt and final, and either party might remarry at once. With these differences in law, it is evident that Nevada was far more attractive than New York to persons migrating for the purpose of securing divorce. It is probable, also, that there is considerable difference between the two States in the customs and practices of the courts granting divorces."[5] Thus, the variation in the legal status of divorce unquestionably is a considerable factor in the variation of the divorce rates in the different States; yet it is certainly not the only explanation of the difference. Customs, occupations, religious faiths, and the like, also exert a considerable influence. The 1927 report mentions a variety of influences that might account for the variations of rates in the different States. Among these are differences in color or race, composition of the population, differences in the proportion of foreign-born in the population, and in the countries from which they came, the relative strength of prevailing religions, particularly the Roman Catholic faith, interstate migration for the purpose of obtaining divorces; and variations in divorce laws and in the practice of courts granting divorces.

Variations in Divorce Rates Within Cities.—Marked differences in divorce rates can be found even in various parts of one and the same city. The average modern city is not one area, but many. It is not homogeneous but heterogeneous. One finds single-home residence districts and rooming-house or apartment-house districts. Again, there are frequently various immigrant colonies of communities, each, perhaps, differing in cultural type and economic status. Thus, also, standards vary from one area of the city to the other. Even family life differs in the different parts, varying from practically non-family areas to large-family areas of the paternal type, such as are quite common among immigrants.

For the city of Chicago, for instance, Mowrer distinguishes 70 different communities.[6] In these family disintegration (divorce and desertion) varies widely, ranging from none at all to 68 per 10,000 population. The average of the city is 25 per 10,000 persons.

Evidently there are cultural differences at work, altogether irrespective of political areas, some tending to further divorce and others, again, serving to check and decrease it. Consequently, mere statistics on divorce will tell little about the actual process of family disintegration. Nor do the causes given in the federal government reports give much insight into the fundamental reasons for divorce. They are largely but blanket terms, categories into which the applicants for divorce must make their excuses fit in order to get legal sanction for the dissolution of the marriage contract and family bond. A variety of causes can be forced into the chief legal categories. "Cruelty" seems to be a very convenient legal cause for divorce today. At any rate, it has become the most popular of all causes that are listed.

---

[5] U. S. Bureau of Census, *Marriage and Divorce Publication*, 1922, p. 13.

[6] Mowrer, E. R., *Family Disorganization*, p. 117.

Divorce and the Duration of Marriage.—The question regarding the number of years marriage lasts before it is broken by divorce, is also one of interest. In recent years the number of divorces granted before marriage had lasted over three years has increased, while the number granted after the marriage had endured eight years has decreased over the period of 1887 to 1906. The proportion of divorces where the marriages had endured four or five years was somewhat smaller, and the proportion where the marriages had endured seven years was somewhat larger in 1927 than in the period 1887 to 1906.

Moreover, if the tendency to divorce were the same at all times in married life, the number of divorces in each successive class in respect to duration would nevertheless be smaller than in the preceding class, because death and divorce make the number of existing marriages in each successive class, in respect to duration, smaller than it was in the preceding class. Then, too, the home is very commonly broken up before the divorce is granted, couples separating much sooner after marriage than they become legally free from the bond. Census statistics also bear this out.

Divorce and the Number of Children Affected.—The question of the children affected by broken homes is a most vital one. Of the 192,037 divorces granted in the United States in 1927, there were 105,924 homes broken up in which there were no children, 68,948 in which children were reported, 13,812 in which no report was made as to children, and 1,456 in which all detailed statistics were lacking. It is probable, according to the government report, that in a large number of cases in which no report was made there were no children, or, at least none so young as to be affected by the decree.

Compared with the period 1887–1906, the proportion of cases of divorce in families with children had decreased in 1922 from about two-fifths to slightly over one-third. Since 1922, however, each succeeding investigation has found an increasing proportion of cases in which children were affected. At each investigation, from the one covering the 1887–1906 period, on up to 1927 inclusive, children were reported more frequently in cases where the divorce was granted to the wife than in the cases in which it was granted to the husband. The plausible explanation suggested for this is that where there are children, the court is more likely in cases of divorce to assign them to the mother. Because of this the father is less likely to seek divorce than the mother, since he would run the risk of losing his children. For the mother, divorce usually means only a severing of the marital relationship and does not involve the loss of children. In the case of the father, however, divorce usually involves a severance of the parental relationship also. Naturally this would make the father more reluctant than the mother about taking the initiative in securing a divorce. This accounts in considerable part, for the greater number of divorces secured by women. In 1927, for instance, there were only 14,867 divorces granted to husbands of families reporting children, as against 54,082 granted to wives of families reporting children.

Childlessness apparently is a very important cause of divorce. In the city of Denver, 90 per cent of the divorces for the year 1927 were given to childless couples.[7] It is the child that develops the parental impulses and cements the union.

---

[7] McMenamin, H., "The Evils of Woman's Revolt against the Old Standards," *Current History*, Vol. XXVII, p. 31.

OTHER FORMS OF BROKEN HOMES

Marriage Annulments.—Declaring a marriage null and void instead of legally dissolving it by divorce, has grown to sufficient proportions to be included in the government's investigation of marriage and divorce conditions. Attention was first given this matter in 1926. The total number of annulments that year was 3,825, that is, one marriage was anulled to every 47.3 marriages terminated by divorce. In 1927, there were 4,255 annulments, as compared with 192,037 divorces; that is, one marriage was annulled to every 45.1 marriage terminated by divorce. The cases of marriage annulment are far from evenly distributed geographically. By States, they ranged from 2 in both Delaware and Wyoming to 1,629 in California, the latter State having over one-third of the total number granted. In only 5 States were more than 100 granted and 11 States had less than 10 each. These variations doubtless are due to various factors, such as the differences in color or race composition of the population, but more so, in all probability to differences in the marriage license laws of the States—in the carefulness with which marriage licenses are issued, in the recognized causes for annulment, and in the practice of the courts.

In both 1926 and 1927, 86 per cent of all annulments were granted for one of the following 3 causes: ''Bigamy,'' ''under legal age,'' ''fraudulent representation.'' Of the total 4,255 annulments, 1,206 were granted for bigamy, 1,519 for fraudulent representation, and 1,152 because of lack of legal age. The term ''fraudulent representation'' seems a particularly broad, general one, under which almost any kind of misrepresentation or concealment might be included. A case of annulment cannot well be classed as a disintegrated home. Rather is it an instance of a home that has never been integrated, at any rate, not legally.

Down through the centuries of Christianity, the Catholic Church has had certain impediments that made marriages, attempted in spite of them, null and void. Because of the great care the Church exercises in her investigation before marriage, these cases can occur but rarely. The recognition of annulments coupled with lax administration of marriage laws could speedily lead to a very unwholesome situation. Incidentally, the annulments of the Church have at times been confused with the notion of divorce.

Family Desertion.—The home broken up through the desertion of one of the parties to the marriage contract is another fairly common form of disintegrated family life. Like divorce, this kind of broken home seems on the increase. Mowrer speaks of it, for instance, as a growing family problem in Chicago, showing that it has increased faster there since 1907 than has the population. Reports from domestic relations courts and social agencies suggest that this is also the case in other parts.

Desertion has not been studied thoroughly enough, nor have a sufficient number of statistics been assembled to warrant any very accurate comparisons between different sections of the country. However, it is generally taken for granted that desertion is rather a characteristic of the urban than of the rural family. The assumption is in all probability a true one, as is suggested by the fact that desertion has been such a popular ground for divorce, which in turn, ranked higher in the city than in the country. Thus of the 945,645 divorces granted in the United States from 1887–1906, 415,545, or 43.9 per cent, were on the ground of desertion or abandonment. Still, desertion is by no means unknown at least in some rural parts.

Desertion has much in common with divorce. The motives behind these forms of broken homes are much the same. Poverty, however, is a greater factor in desertion than in divorce. Hence, desertion rather characterizes the poorer group and divorce the middle and upper classes. In fact, desertion is often referred to as "the poor man's divorce." In these poorer homes, it frequently happens that men desert during hard times, periods of unemployment, or when another child is born into the family. They leave their family behind temporarily in order to avoid a disagreeable situation or difficult obligation. Yet, even when the cause is rather a matter of family incompatibility than of economic difficulty, or when the family is permanently repudiated and not only temporarily left behind, desertion rather than divorce is resorted to by many of the poorer classes, simply because they are more familiar with the former method of escape than with the more intricate procedure of the court which is necessary for the procuring of a dissolution of the legal bond by means of divorce. Usually, too, the poorer classes have less to lose socially and professionally by resorting to desertion than have those of the higher strata of society.

Homes Broken by Death.—The death of either parent in a family also results in a broken home. This is, of course, a family problem that the human race has always had to contend with in greater or lesser degree. The many hazards of our machine age have undoubtedly increased the number of these broken homes in modern times. The remaining parent in such a broken home must work against odds in the rearing of the children. In some instances, remarriage repairs the family broken by death of father or mother, but frequently, the newly formed group does not become any too well integrated. The children miss the former atmosphere to which they had become accustomed and they remain unsuccessfully adjusted to the new. Such a home seldom functions as normally as did the original group. It may be, however, the best way of solving a difficult situation.

EFFECTS OF BROKEN HOMES

The consequences of broken homes are manifold and seriously harmful. Very commonly the main purposes of the family institution are frustrated, in whole or in part. Particularly are innocent children made to suffer, frequently for life. But even when there are no children, the severing of the marital tie is of great social significance. The parties to the broken contract suffer, and the broken home is hurtful to society as a whole. Perhaps the consequences in the case of divorce are the worst. At any rate, this is by far the greater part of the present problem of broken homes.

Effect upon the Divorced.—If the home had really been integrated, if a really deep and abiding love had developed between husband and wife, the severing of the marriage bond could not but be accompanied by much pain. Even in case genuine affection remains only on the part of one spouse, the separation for that one must invariably leave a serious scar, perhaps even a wound that cannot heal.

Divorce is a mortifying disillusionment, to say the least. On the part of those who entered marriage with any seriousness, it means a shattered life dream. Moreover, there is little reason to believe that the dream will come true in a second attempt, when it failed in the first instance. Love usually gives place to hate. In case much publicity is given the divorce trial, the parties will only be embittered the more and stamp the hate in deeper. "Speaking from a purely human standpoint," says Mrs. Kathleen Norris,[8] "there is no modern institution so completely and dramatically a failure as the institution of divorce. It is working like a sort of hate factory in our midst, creating enmities and silences and coldness in a world that for two thousand years has been struggling to lessen the sickening total of them. Its cruelty to innocent childhood is proverbial, its effect upon society is ruinous and the thousands of embittered and useless women it sets adrift upon our communities every year are a real menace to sober, self-controlled, Christian living.

"The divorced women are of all types, but they have two points in common: each one wants above all other things to tell you just how wronged and how angelic she was, as a wife, and each one wants immediately to remarry. If she does remarry, she adds, with simplicity, that the children adore their new father, and that she is going to be absolutely happy.

---

[8] Norris, K., "A Plea for Less 'Happy' Talk," *Catholic World*, Vol. XIII, p. 4.

"If love is an essential attribute of heaven, then surely hate is an attribute of hell, and I have never felt so close to the latter place as when in the company of the divorced woman who is obliged to hate violently and incessantly, or to admit that she herself was at fault.

"She is not entirely 'happy' with the second husband, but she must continue to hate the first. The son of the first hates his stepfather. The daughter hates spending six months a year with each parent, during which time she hears the other parent bitterly scored: the old grandparents on both sides have hideous stories to tell: the whole atmosphere is stifling to the soul." And the other side of the picture, that of the man, differs only in detail.

The Disintegrated Home and the Child.—It is the children of broken homes who suffer most, and who suffer altogether unjustly. Only too frequently do we hear the cry of juvenile delinquency dinned into our ears today. Yet, with our numerous broken homes, nothing else could be expected. There is no room for doubt, regarding the relation between youthful delinquency and divorce. Social workers find this form of broken home constantly recurring as a primary, or at least secondary, factor in the erring ways of children. Brought into contact with malign influences and robbed of the affection that is characteristic of normal family life, the children of homes broken by divorce get a distorted view of life and are readily filled with resentments which later show themselves in anti-social conduct. Their training must give them a poor foundation for their own future family life.

The social consequences for the children are much the same in the case of desertion as they are in divorce. Even when the family is broken by death, the home functions as a broken instrument. Though the bitterness and resentment engendered in children of homes broken by divorce and desertion are lacking in the case of the home mutilated by death, nevertheless, even in the latter case, an unusual amount of delinquency and unsuccessful social adjustment is found on the part of the children.

The main purpose of the family is the physical, mental, and moral training of children. Educators, social-workers, prison-wardens, and others are repeatedly making the observation that children who miss a good home training in childhood suffer serious loss from which they never recover. All testify that children of broken homes are found disproportionately among the delinquents. Then there are other disastrous effects, consequences which are deeply harmful, yet do not lend themselves readily to any system of cataloging or statistical enumeration. Though a child's conduct may remain anything but anti-social, its whole life may become warped as a result of its contact with a broken home.

Factual studies that show the effect of the broken home upon children have recently multiplied.[9] By way of example, there is the fairly extensive study of the home conditions of delinquent boys in industrial schools in 31 States, showing that over half their number came from broken homes. Again, while it is estimated that 25 per cent of all the children in the United States come from homes broken by death, desertion, separation, or divorce, studies of various groups of delinquents show that from 40 to 70 per cent of them come from broken homes.[10] Such results can hardly be said to be unexpected. Such homes cannot function normally. The broken home involves an abnormal situation. Actual facts are now at hand to convince even those who might not otherwise believe it, that bad social consequences inevitably develop in relative proportion to the growth of disintegrated home-life. In other words, the success of home-life depends upon the degree of inherent integration of the family group.

---

[9] Cardes, J., "A Study of Fifty Delinquent Boys," *Journal of Applied Sociology*, May, 1923, p. 273; Slawson, J., "Marital Relations of Parents and Juvenile Delinquency," *Journal of Delinquency*, Vol. VIII, p. 280.

[10] Schiedeler, E. H., "The Delinquent Boy," *Journal American Institute Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. VIII, p. 713.

The Disorganized Home and the Child.—Not only the totally disorganized, or the disintegrated and broken home, affects the child injuriously, but also the partially disorganized familial group fails to bring about the results legitimately expected of it. There are many homes that show but little vitality and yet are not actually dissolved, either legally or otherwise. In varying degree may the family spirit break down and, quite in proportion, does the home fail in its functions. It is exceptional for a home to break down and disintegrate suddenly; ordinarily the process is gradual. Thread by thread the family fabric weakens; the bonds loosen; tensions increase; finally a crisis develops and the disintegration is complete. Yet from the beginning of the disorganization were the untoward social consequences felt by the family members. Frequently the process of disintegration is never completed; nevertheless much harm may be done the members of the group. Thus, we have already noted how the Industrial Revolution has affected the normal training process of many children because of separation between parent and child in the various activities of daily life. Tension and conflict within the domestic circle will only add to the harmful results.

Undoubtedly, discord within the home falls more heavily upon children than upon adults. Family friction readily wounds the sensitive natures of children and exercises a detrimental influence over them. Practically any stress and tension will tire and worry the average child. Chronic discord will likely leave such a mark that it will act in similar fashion when emergencies arise in its own future life.

Moreover, even mere difference in attitudes and ideals on the part of the parents, quite aside from any outright friction or discord, may readily lead to unwholesome effects upon children. Such homes function with difficulty. Thus, difference of belief on the part of parents has frequently been found to lead to indifferentism, or no belief, on the part of the children. Difference in the moral standards of parents will very likely involve moral confusion in the minds of children. Under stress of temptation this lack of definite moral conviction will show itself in unwholesome overt acts. It may be that outward conventions are observed on the part of such children, but since they lack a definite moral code, one can hardly look for unflinching adherence to ideal moral standards of behavior at all times. The important part that faith and these standards should play in the home, becomes quite impossible of fulfilment. The results are socially detrimental.

Again, a difference in culture on the part of the husband and wife may easily cause tensions that become harmful to the children. Perhaps a greater source of harm to the child is the difference between the culture of its own home and that of other groups with which it comes in constant contact. This is a difficulty particularly peculiar to immigrant families in this country. The parents frequently keep to the ways of the mother-country. The children, through contacts outside the home, adopt American *mores*. The latter begin to look upon the parents as old-fashioned. A tug between parent and child develops. There is an ever-increasing dissatisfaction with home-life on the part of the children. Eventually there may be open revolt against parental authority. The gulf between parent and child widens until it can no longer be bridged and wholesome influence of the former over the latter is rendered impossible. The children drift more and more away from the home and its influence. The gang and street element that they associate with helps to feed the attitude of disrespect for authority that began within the home. Anti-social conduct follows. It is not surprising that immigrant children are found in such considerable numbers among our urban delinquents.

Other types of disorganized home-life might be selected and the results shown to be ever the same. All disorganized homes function as broken instruments, and the children inevitably show the results.

On the other hand, it is uncommon for delinquents to come from good or well-established homes. Thus, taking 1,000 cases each in Chicago and Boston, Healy and Bronner [11] found that only 5 per cent of these repeated offenders in Chicago, and 10 per cent in Boston, came from what might be considered good homes. Any program to reduce delinquency, therefore, will have to begin in the home. Any program to better the training of children will have to begin in the home. And the success of the program will depend upon the degree of inherent integration of the home.

The Effect upon Society.—The broken home harms not only the parties to the original marriage contract and the children born to their union, society generally, is also made to suffer in many different ways. These far-reaching and unwholesome social effects of homes broken by divorce are briefly and well set forth in the pastoral letter of the bishops and archbishops of the United States.[12] "We consider the growth of the divorce evil," it states, "an evidence of moral decay and a present danger to the best elements in our American life. In its causes and their revelation by process of law, in its results for those who are immediately concerned, and its suggestion to the mind of the entire community, divorce is our national scandal. It not only disrupts the home of the separated parties, but it also leads others who are not yet married, to look upon the bond as a trivial circumstance. Thus through the ease and frequency with which it is granted, divorce increases with an evil momentum until it passes the limits of decency and reduces the sexual relation to the level of the animal instinct.

"This degradation of marriage once considered the holiest of human relations, naturally tends to the injury of other things whose efficacy ought to be secured not by coercion, but by the freely given consent of a free people. Public authority, individual rights and even the institutions upon which liberty depends must inevitably weaken."

---

[11] Healy, W. and Bronner, A., *Delinquents and Criminals; Their Making and Unmaking*, pp. 127–128.

[12] "Pastoral Letter of the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States" (*N. C. W. C. Publication*, Washington, D. C., 1920), pp. 53–54.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. What is the divorce rate in your county?
2. Does any form of modern charity promote desertion?
3. What is meant by trial divorce?
4. How may divorce lawyers hurt the home?
5. Is there any law in your State regarding desertion?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Divorce," *Catholic Encyclopedia.*

CLOW, L., "Motherless Children," *The Family,* March, 1928.

COLCORD, J. C., *Broken Homes.*

DEALEY, J. Q., *The Family in its Sociological Aspects,* Ch. IX.

ELLWOOD, C. A., *Sociology and Modern Social Problems,* Ch. VIII.

EUBANK, E. E., "A Study of Family Desertion." (*Thesis,* Chicago University).

HOWARD, G. E., *A History of Matrimonial Institutions,* Chs. XVII, XVIII.

KARPF, M. J., "The Demoralized Family," *Journal of Sociological Forces,* Vol. 1, No. 4.

LICHTENBERGER, J. P., *Divorce.*

PATTERSON, S. H., "Family Desertion and Non-Support," *Journal of Delinquency,* Vol. VII, Nos. 5, 6.

RICHMOND, M. E. and HALL, F. S., *Marriage Legislation.*

SCHIEDELER, "Family Disintegration and the Delinquent Boy in the United States," *Journal of Criminal Law,* Vol. VIII, No. 5.

SPENSER, A. G., *The Family and Its Members,* Ch. XII.

U. S. Bureau of Census, *Reports on Marriage and Divorce,* 1867–1927.

U. S. Children's Bureau, "Maternal Mortality," Publication No. 158.

PART III

FAMILY RE-INTEGRATION

FAMILY RE-INTEGRATION

The foregoing section directed attention to fundamental causes of the modern disintegrated family such as the Industrial Revolution, a pleasure philosophy of life, individualism, rationalism, and immigration. In pointing out these causes and in describing the resultant conditions, many possible solutions for particular phases of the problem of family reconstruction undoubtedly suggested themselves. The previous section treating of the integrated family of the past also suggested some remedies. Yet the question of re-integrating the modern family is of sufficient importance to warrant further and more detailed treatment of some of the ways and means of familial betterment.

First of all, for sound family life there must be sound characters. The individual must be trained to self-control and to a sense of responsibility. Fundamental also is the selection of a suitable mate, if the family is to weather the storms of modern life and satisfactorily to perform its functions.

The resources that still remain within the familial group must be carefully husbanded and used to the utmost advantage. While the home has been robbed of many of its former integrating functions, there are still within it resources, particularly of a more spiritual nature, that can serve the twofold purpose of binding the group members into harmonious unison and of making possible the fulfilment of the purposes of the family.

But little can be accomplished unless a definite stand is taken against some of the disorganizing influences at work within the social organism. Some of these have become a part of our civilization; they have become the *Zeitgeist* of the day. Individualism is an example of this.

There can be no question of a return from a machinofacture culture to an agricultural economy. The change brought on by the Industrial Revolution will continue, and the home will have to be adapted to the new situation. Particularly during the period of transition from the one culture to the other will conscious effort and intelligent planning be necessary if family life is to prove successful.

In the growing complexity of our civilization the home must more and more look to the help of other institutions. Particular attention will be given to some of the possibilities of help that may be expected from the Church, the state and the school.

CHAPTER XIV

PRE-MARITAL PREPARATION

The ills of the family are as complicated as human nature and as complex as our present-day civilization. Hence we need not look for any panacea or cure-all solution for re-integrating the family. Yet with initiative and intelligent effort, certainly more can be done for the welfare of family life than is in reality being done to-day. Much more can be done by way of preparation before marriage and by thoughtful care and consideration after the establishment of a family. In the present chapter we are interested first of all in the matter of pre-marital preparation as a means of establishing vigorous families and promoting wholesome familial relationships to the end that much family friction and the eventual breakdown of homes may be avoided.

In the problem of the modern family, as in all social problems, emphasis must first of all be placed upon preventive work and constructive measures. To wait until a family has become totally disrupted and then to try to rebuild it, is to attempt a big task and frequently, a hopeless one. Some effective remedial work may be done, particularly in the case of but partially disorganized families. Yet in this, as in all other fields of social work, curative work alone is quite unsatisfactory and even disappointing. The logical starting point, therefore, for any program that seeks to re-integrate the disintegrated modern family is pre-marital preparation, a sincere effort, in the first instance, to build strong families, to establish wholesome and well-organized homes.

Individual Preparation.—Preparation for marriage on the part of the individual is a matter of utmost importance. Such preparation must result as the normal outgrowth of the training the individual receives during all the years which precede the establishment of his family life. The formation of character, the development of a sense of responsibility and of moral stamina, all elements, in fact, that are essential for living a healthy social life, are necessary for the observance of wholesome social relations within the family circle. The favorable growth of such qualities can be the fruit only of many long years of careful and intelligent training.

Some more specialized training for marriage and family life has also become necessary today. This is no longer so automatically cared for in the family itself as was the case in the past. This special training will be referred to elsewhere. Suffice it here to add that the individual who hopes to enter upon a successful married career must be prepared for it physically, mentally, and morally, as well as religiously, emotionally, and financially.

The Selection of Mate.—Granted satisfactory preparation on the part of the individual who is about to found a home, another all-important preparatory measure is the selection of a suitable mate. Mismating, or failure in the selection of suitable mates, is looked upon by students of family life as one of its most fundamental evils today. Hence, in seeking to renew modern family life, attention may well be centered considerably upon the question of a selection of a suitable life-partner. The choice should be intelligently made. It is perhaps the most serious choice the average individual has to make in a lifetime. Yet, to make it intelligently, acquaintanceship with, and knowledge of a number of possible life-partners, is necessary. The range and character of the individual's acquaintanceship will primarily settle his eventual choice of a partner. It is fortunate indeed if the individual has a fairly wide range of friendships with companions who might become suitable life-partners. If this is the case he will not be likely to be disastrously wrong when he eventually falls in love.

Many, however, are not so fortunate. In spite of our free association of the sexes, mismating is a very real problem to-day because of the difficulties thrown in the way of normal acquaintanceship and association by our urban life and culture. In the days of the stable rural villages and neighborhoods, acquaintanceship with a group of companions was, so to speak, automatically brought about. It was quite a simple matter for prospective mates to get to know each other, as well as to know each other's respective home backgrounds and family stocks. Commonly they attended the same school and church for years and took part in the same neighborhood amusements and activities. Usually their training and social standards were much the same. Visiting in each other's homes was the fashion. All this not only made for similarity of background and viewpoint, but also for intimate acquaintanceship. It laid the foundations for an intelligent choice of a life-partner.

But in the modern city the situation is quite different. Very generally the spirit of neighborliness is lacking there, and opportunities for close acquaintanceship are much more limited. Those who are close to one another physically are not near to one another socially. The free and spontaneous appeal of sympathy and interest in one another is practically forbidden. It is particularly in the congested sections of urban life that this social sense of reserve is at its height. Out of a sheer sense of social protection, people there erect almost impenetrable conventional barriers against their nearest neighbors. As a result, the closest neighbors are frequently total strangers to one another. There is not the friendly neighborly visiting of the past. There are few neighborhood activities in which the young can take a common part and thus have the opportunity for companionship and acquaintanceship with the opposite sex. Much recreation is in the bright-light areas, far removed from the family hearth and even from the home neighborhood. Many girls avowedly go to public dance halls in the hope of there some day meeting the "right man" that they may marry. The dance hall, too, is often the only opportunity afforded the young man to strike up acquaintanceship with other young women than the few he may meet occasionally in a business way. Such acquaintanceships are more or less accidental and the matings that result are only too frequently between persons who know practically nothing about each other and their families, and whose entire social backgrounds are in many ways dissimilar. Much mismating is but the logical result of this condition. The dance hall, with its studied politeness, and the week-end party, with its artificial manners, will not reveal the character and disposition of a person as did the freer and less reserved social contact within the home circle, or the years of intermingling in various neighborhood activities so common in small and stable rural groups.

It is true, an energetic individual may be able to widen his circle of friends and increase the extent of his acquaintanceship beyond the few individuals that circumstances might normally bring across his path. But it is not an easy task, and such agencies as the Church and fraternal organizations might well put forth special effort to be of service to young people in this matter. Parents, too, should go out of their way if necessary, to keep up a close acquaintanceship with a number of families into which their children might expect to marry and see to it that opportunity is afforded the young of these families to intermingle and to get acquainted in the proper environment.

Steps Leading to Marriage.—Various conventional periods and various customs that play a part in the process of selecting a mate and in entering the state of matrimony are commonly distinguished. Outstanding among these are what may be called the flirtation period, courtship, engagement or betrothal, the marriage ceremony, and the honeymoon. All have their peculiar meaning and also their special value, if properly made use of. There are also certain hazards that become detrimental to the parties concerned unless guarded against.

The selection of a mate is a serious project and may well in a certain sense extend over the greater part of pre-nuptial life. The early years of childhood, it is true, have little or no part in the making of this important choice. At this age sex differences show themselves very little if at all, in the social relations of boys and girls. There is neither mutual attraction towards one another nor aversion to the opposite sex. Very generally both sexes play and associate together indiscriminately. Just preceding the development of adolescence, however, a change in their attitudes towards each other takes place. The sexes become quite conscious of each other and there is a noticeable tendency for them to remain socially distant from one another. Instead of any mutual interest, there is a tendency to avoid each other's company. Instead of any attraction towards one another, there is rather a mild form of disdain for the members of the opposite sex. A party arranged for a number of boys and girls at this age can easily turn out to be a stilted affair indeed.

The Flirtation Period.—Another change, quite contrary to the one linked with the growth of early adolescence, sets in about the middle of the teens. At this period the opposite sexes become extremely interesting to each other. There begins a mild form of courtship commonly called flirtation. The attraction of the sexes during this period of so-called "puppy love" is usually not accompanied by any deep and abiding affection for any one particular individual. The boy centers his attention upon a series of girls and the girls take the same attitude toward boys. It is in reality a trial-and-error period and usually plays no unimportant part in the selection of a suitable mate. It serves gradually to shape in the mind of the youth and maiden a picture of an ideal companion, of the kind of partner they hope some day to take in marriage. Moreover, it is an experience that fits the individuals for the more serious love-making of later life. After some time they begin gradually to narrow down the range of choice to a smaller and smaller number before courtship proper sets in.

Child Marriages.—There is a hazard in connection with this flirtation period, the risk, namely, of child marriage. Throughout the flirtation period the youth and maiden are, as a rule, not in an urgently marrying frame of mind. Yet there are exceptions to this rule, in which the usual process is suddenly halted by marriage. In fact, these so-called child-marriages have in modern times taken on considerable proportions and have done not a little to increase the disintegrating tendencies of the modern family. Thus Richmond and Hall[1] have estimated that in 1920 there were approximately 343,000 women and girls in the United States who began their married life at fifteen or under and that there were 324,000 husbands who began their married life at seventeen or under. This means that there was a total of 667,000 persons, excluding children, whose lives were influenced by child-marriages. Little can be said in favor of these marriages. Not only is there commonly no careful choice of mate, but the parties to the contract are not sufficiently matured to undertake the establishment of wholesome homes or the rearing of vigorous families in our complex modern civilization. Child-marriages, therefore, far from being any remedy for the present precarious position of the family, are highly detrimental thereto. They can only be condemned as unfortunate and harmful.

The Courtship Period.—As average individuals begin seriously to contemplate marriage, they enter upon a conventional period of further preparation popularly known as courtship. The man, for instance, selects from his group of associates the woman he considers the nearest approach to his ideal of a mate, and, if the latter is responsive, the two strike up a companionship more exclusive than was heretofore the case. The chief purposes of this conventional period of courting are, to make possible a more intimate knowledge of each other, to test each other's disposition and sound out their peculiar characteristics, to "fall in love" in preparation for marriage, and to make certain of the genuineness of their love for each other. These various purposes show the great importance of an intelligent courtship. Great values lie hid in the right kind of courtship intelligently carried on. But just as the individual finds it difficult under modern conditions to gather around himself a sufficiently large number of companions of the opposite sex from which he may eventually expect to make his choice of life partner, so, too, does he often find that these same conditions greatly hamper him in his efforts to carry on a normal courtship. Above all, courtship cannot be carried on so extensively in the home circle today as was the case in the past. This is, in general, due to urban congestion, and more particularly, to conditions of poverty and poor housing facilities. In many instances the normal purposes of courtship cannot be realized, while elements of risk and hazard are added that may easily prove harmful to the individuals and detrimental to their future married life.

---

[1] Richmond, M. E. and Hall, F. S., *Child Marriages*, pp. 56–58.

Inadequate facilities for courtship seem also to play a considerable part in many hurried marriages that have recently become quite common. These hasty marriages are also commonly ill-advised marriages. Without an intimate acquaintanceship with each other and a testing of each other's temperament there is no sound basis upon which to determine the advisability of marriage between two individuals. They can know neither each other's personal qualifications nor each other's social backgrounds. Yet a knowledge of both is necessary for an intelligent choice of a marital partner. Hence, to marry without courtship, or after a very brief courtship, especially when there was no acquaintanceship beforehand, is to act very rashly in a matter of most serious importance. Failure to pay due court is to court shipwreck.

The time element in courtship, it is true, cannot be entirely measured by days. Much depends upon the opportunities within reach for knowing the person who is to be taken as a life mate. Moreover, courtship can be too long as well as too brief. In case of the long drawn out period of courting, differences that may exist between the two may be exaggerated and even a breach created that can no longer be bridged over. The other extreme is, however, by far the more common danger today. Marriage is hurriedly entered upon under the influence of a temporary spell of infatuation. Time is not taken to come down from an ethereal super-level so that the two individuals can get an unclouded view of each other and can distinguish between the real and the fictitious in each other's personality. After the emotional fog has cleared away, the stark reality alone remains, and they may be speedily forced to conclude that their marriage was ill-advised, indeed. It is of the utmost importance for the future of the family that the young keep well in mind that infatuation and exaggerated romanticism are of a transient nature, while marriage endures. The glamor of courtship may last for weeks and even for months, but marriage should last for years. Normally, hurried marriages do not build well-integrated families. In the interests of a progressive family reconstruction, they should be banned.

Over-spending, a Common Courtship Hazard.—The question of the extent to which money should be spent during the courtship period is not always an easy one to answer. Each individual case must be decided on its own merits. Yet it is certain that in many instances both men and women spend more than they can really afford. Economy is usually not a strong point of the average youthful American, particularly during the fascinating period of love-making. The girl is more commonly tempted to over-spend for dress. She may even harmfully stint herself with regard to actual necessities in order to be able to compete the better with others in her efforts to gain and hold the favor of a man. This may accustom her to finery that she cannot have after marriage, and adjustment to a lower standard may later prove an unpleasant task. It may easily lead to trouble and family friction.

Some men also are given to over-spending in order to win and hold the interest of a girl. To some extent they are forced to it. If the young man is inclined to be sparing, many a modern girl will interpret his attitude as one of niggardliness and, perhaps, even break off the companionship. At present there seems to be a growing spirit in favor of the girl paying her own way at least in part. Cases are not unknown in which working girls meet their "steadies" after work hours and hand them their pocketbooks out of which the latter may take what is necessary to meet their expenses for the evening. One could readily see more harm than good in such a practice if it became at all common.

The Engagement or Betrothal.—After the selection of a mate and successful courting of the same, there usually follows the period of betrothal or engagement. This is another social convention of long standing and, like other such customs, is not without special purpose and also considerable benefit to family life. The engagement period should, first of all, give a final opportunity to determine pretty definitely whether compatibility exists or not. It is also the proper time for a couple to discuss definite plans for their future married life. Some agreement might very advantageously be reached regarding such matters as finances; whether, for instance, all resources are to be pooled, whether the wife is to work outside the home, where and on what scale housekeeping is to be started, and a host of other similar practical questions. More personal matters must be given attention at this time also. Dr. Cooper points out, for instance, that definite instruction regarding the marital relation is a matter of special moment that requires attention. "If not before engagement," he writes, "certainly before marriage, and a good time before, the parties concerned should know in what marriage and the marital relation essentially consist. Notwithstanding all our supposed youthful sophistication, it is astonishing how much of nescience prevails, more often among girls, occasionally among boys, and not so rarely even among those of both sexes who pass for and consider themselves sophisticated. Both the man and the woman should have a talk well beforehand with a high-minded and informed physician. So far as the girl is concerned, it may be well to recall that ignorance and innocence are not synonymous. To let even the most 'innocent' girl go into marriage ignorant of what the physical basis of marriage consists in is to run the risk of profound emotional shock that often has grave consequences to both her own and her husband's happiness, and to their mutual love and common welfare.''[2]

The Wedding.—The wedding is a formal ceremony by which the days of courtship and the betrothal period are brought to a close and married life begins. It is a public recognition that the couple are now husband and wife and that the two have assumed the duties and privileges consequent upon the marital union. The ceremony is a formality commonly required by law, yet, it is not without some effect upon the married life of the contracting parties. It may, on the one hand, serve the purpose of giving them a very propitious start upon the matrimonial sea; on the other hand, it may prove a source of friction that will become detrimental, and even disastrous, to the newly founded home. Until quite recent times the wedding day was looked upon as one of the greatest days in a woman's life. All possible solemnity was lent to the occasion. Relatives, friends, and neighbors gathered in considerable numbers to rejoice with the pair, while the ceremony was made as public as possible and as elaborate as means would allow. Many willing hands were ready to help in order that all might go smoothly and that the bride and groom might be spared all possible worry and fatigue. Yet, some flaw in the arrangements was always possible and some ''breaks'' at times occurred that grated upon nerves that were at high tension owing to strain and embarrassment. Such things could mar the day and leave a mark not easily erased from memory. Much more generally, however, both bride and groom carried with them into their new life a large store of happy and pleasant memories of the event that marked their entrance into married life. The Church still favors this attitude of the past and is eager to clothe the marriage ceremony with all the wealth of her ritual.

---

[2] Cooper, J. M., *Religion Outlines for Colleges*, Course IV, pp. 108–109.

More recently, however, the situation has changed somewhat. The custom of leaving one's accustomed environment for the marriage, of having the simplest wedding possible, and even of avoiding everything except the minimum of legal requirements has grown considerably. There is an air of secretiveness thrown around marriage quite in contrast to the former publicity. Much more unfortunate is the fact that, to no small degree, are the legal requirements not observed. For instance, an extensive house-to-house canvass [3] of ninety blocks in the better roomer area north of Chicago Avenue, revealed that 71 per cent of all the houses in this district take roomers and that, of the people who live in these rooms, 52 per cent are single men, 10 per cent are single women, and 38 per cent are couples, ''married''—supposedly with the help of the clergy, though actually 60 per cent of these couples are living together unmarried. Moreover, half of our States still recognize common law marriages, that is, they require no formal marriage ceremony. The more secret marriages are quite commonly cases of hasty unions, though they are also found in other instances. In an occasional marriage the practice may be altogether warranted and entirely in place. More frequently however, it smacks of an unwholesome secrecy and has at least the negative result of not furnishing the healthful and helpful influence which the impressive ceremonial of the past commonly provided.

The Honeymoon.—The honeymoon is another social convention, apparently of recent origin, but now quite common in our civilization. Its prime purpose is evidently to give the newly wedded couple the opportunity to affect a normal adjustment to their new life situation, to transfer from the atmosphere of courtship to the realities of married life. At times it also serves the purpose of affording at least temporary relief from, and protection against, rather coarse and unwelcome horse-play on the part of acquaintances. After the strain and nervous tension of the wedding, the couple are in a mood for restful quiet and peaceful repose. Any pleasant form of travel, affording a change of environment and removing from old associations should help to make the important transition from courtship to wedlock agreeable.

---

[3] Zorbaugh, H. W., "Roomers," *Survey*, Vol. LVI, p. 462.

A normal transition from courtship to marriage, from the exciting anteroom to the deeper and more real joys of married life, is of the utmost importance to the newly founded family. Particularly is there danger that the transition be brought about too suddenly. It is but rare that individuals enamored of each other during courtship allow their emotional attitudes to settle sufficiently to enable them to take an undistorted view of each other. But after marriage has been entered upon the more ephemeral element of romanticism is likely to begin waning.

This tendency usually shows itself earlier on the part of the man than on the part of the woman. The latter can more readily give his attention to material pursuits and practical interests than can the former. The woman is more likely to expect the marriage to continue on indefinitely upon the same emotional plane of courtship days. While proper interest in his home and due affection for his wife and children are altogether to be expected from the man, he could not fulfil the hopeless task of keeping up throughout the years of married life an artificially stimulated spirit of emotional idealism of pre-nuptial days. The transition into the calmer and more satisfying experiences of happy married life must be made. But it is of the utmost importance that it be carefully and properly made. Particularly is there danger of making this transition too suddenly, at least the one party to the contract feeling that now their life-dream is passed and gone and the most interesting part of their life is over. The particular purpose of the honeymoon is to start the couple propitiously on the road to success in their new relations of marriage.

The Pre-nuptial Years and the Development of the Affections.—The normal growth of genuine affection is a matter that must be given careful attention if love is to serve its full purpose in the development of the individual and in the establishment of family life. This is made possible by our free association of the sexes throughout the pre-nuptial years. It ranks well in importance with the opportunity for an intelligent selection of a mate that is made possible by such association.

The individual's tastes, particularly his tastes in love, are an all-important factor in the development of his personality and character. But tastes must be cultivated and developed from bud to bloom; they are not inborn. Tastes in love must be gradually formed throughout the years of the teens. The development of these tastes includes an appreciation of the personal qualifications and subtle harmonies essential for happiness throughout a life-long companionship. And not only will the development of tastes and personality but also the foundation of the happiness of the individual and his reactions in later family life largely depend upon the cultivation of the affections in adolescent years.

Such cultivation of the affections demands a certain amount of sex companionship during the pre-nuptial days. When well-chosen and carefully guarded, friendships between the sexes become an ennobling and inspiring influence in the lives of young people. And since no two personalities are alike, the influence which comes from a considerable number of finely nurtured friendships will contribute more generously to a well-rounded personality than would the influence of but a few. Moreover, too close confinement to a single friendship, or very limited number of friendships, will involve the risk of the individual being swayed by blind infatuation rather than by genuine love. Quite aside from other evils, this would handicap him in the selection of a suitable life-partner. There should be a variety of such companionships.

The Sex Hazard.—While our systems of free association of the sexes during the various conventional periods of premarital preparation makes possible the development of the affections—a matter of great importance to the individual's future family life—it also carries with it the manifold dangers of sex license. When the sex impulse intrudes and the physical side gets the upper hand over the higher and finer psychical elements of the love complex, genuine love is superseded by lust. The real purposes of love are left unrealized, while results follow that are detrimental to the individual and particularly to his future family life. As a matter of fact, the sex element is given considerably greater prominence and stress to-day than was the case but a few decades ago. And an attitude of license before marriage has greatly increased the familial turmoil and disaster caused by sex incompatibility after marriage.

The attitude of license, particularly as it manifests itself in the various physical liberties between young men and women, is popularly referred to as "petting." Petting is really play at love. It is a mock love that stimulates the intimacies of real love. It possesses none of the values or benefits of genuine love. It bristles with dangers detrimental to the future family life of the parties involved in the practice. Thus petting culminates in a lower order of love. It hinders a fine culture of the affectional life. Experience with mock love does not prepare one for an appreciation of genuine love. The simulations of the intimacies of genuine love tend to limit, rather than to develop the most precious elements and capacities of the personality. While in real love the deepest physical intimacies may serve love's highest spiritual ends, in the mock love called petting, such intimacies lose their spiritual meaning and minister primarily to the animal sense. Physical liberties become unlovely, vulgar and degrading when employed in such a travesty of love.[4]

---

[4] Exner, J. M., "The Question of Petting; reprint from *Association Men*, March, 1926.

Petting, therefore, degrades the marriage ideal. It does irreparable harm to family life. Failure to cultivate genuine love in pre-marital days leaves one unprepared to enter upon family life with a satisfactory basis for a permanently satisfying relationship. To cultivate the affectional capacities by means of the mock love of petting and to identify that with marital love is to prepare for an order of nuptial life that will in all likelihood grow progressively dull and unsatisfactory. In such a relationship the law of diminishing returns soon sets to work and eventual disillusionment, distaste and divorce is the result. Only too frequently does the process work out that way.

As genuine love develops an appreciation of the higher personal qualifications of prospective mates, petting or mock love tends to blind one against discrimination in the higher personal values. Under the influence of over-stimulation of the physical urge the petter does not sufficiently weigh the spiritual, or he even entirely sweeps it aside. But mere physical attraction does not provide a satisfactory basis for life-long companionship in the intimate relationship of wedded life. Hence the result frequently must be disillusionment and dissatisfaction after marriage.

Young people, therefore, can gain nothing by trifling with love, the supreme source of human happiness. They can only lose by squandering in pre-marital days the power of love which is meant one day to be the greatest natural influence in their lives. The purity of young people is the best guarantee of future happy marriages and a satisfactory home-life. Nor is any abandonment to physical expression necessary for the selection of a mate. Love's impulses lie close enough to the surface to reveal the magnetism of personality and natures attuned to each other, without such gratification and exploitation.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. What kind of honeymoon is the best preparation for happy married life?

2. Describe the Church's wedding ceremony. What are its benefits?
3. What agencies can be helpful in promoting preparation for marriage?
4. Is the average modern working girl sufficiently prepared for marriage and home life?
5. What is the history of chaperonage in this country?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cooper, J. M., *Religion Outlines for Colleges,* Course IV, Ch. 7.
Gans, B. S., *Concerning Parents,* pp. 137–157.
Husslein, J., *Courtship and Marriage.*
Popenoe, P., *Modern Marriage.*
Westermarck, E., *A History of Human Marriage,* Vol. I, Ch. 13.

CHAPTER XV

THE QUALIFICATIONS OF A MATE

In treating the question of an intelligent choice of a mate in the preceding chapter no special attention was given to any definite qualifications that should be looked for in a mate. Passing mention was made of the qualification of love. This basic element of family life is given repeated attention throughout the book. Because of the importance of the selection of a suitable mate, however, and because of the present great amount of mismating, some special attention may very well be given to other major desirable qualifications in a marital partner.

Rating the Desirable Qualifications.—During the past few years a number of lists of qualifications have been drawn up and rated in their order of importance by various groups, particularly by college students of both sexes. In the lists are usually found such items as health, wealth, looks, intelligence, education, disposition, moral character, housekeeping ability, attitude towards children, religion, similarity in tastes, interests, etc.[1]

Of these, the traits that receive most frequent mention on the part of the men as desirable in a wife, are: health, intelligence, moral character, good disposition, willingness, and ability to rear a family. Good looks, together with wealth, housekeeping ability, and such like, were commonly placed in a lower category. In the Notre Dame *Religious Survey,* 1925–1926, besides a statistical enumeration of the chief qualifications mentioned in answer to the question "What type of a girl do you want to marry?" a number of individual students' comments are recorded. A rather serious vein runs through all of them. The following few, selected at random, should give a kind of cross-section of the views of these students regarding this important matter: "One who knows the responsibilities of family life"; "One who can manage and make a real home"; "One who places her home before society"; "A clean, intelligent woman, who can and will be a real mother"; "A clean, healthy, up-to-date girl." "A modern girl—she must be principled and have ideals." "Something between conservative and ultra-modern." "One who is just a draw between the good old-fashioned kind and the modern girl." A few, it is true, could not see beyond a "blond with blue eyes."

---

[1] Popenoe, P., *Modern Marriage,* Ch. II; Cooper, J. M., *Religion Outline for Colleges,* Course IV, Ch. VI.

On the part of the girls, the principal traits demanded of their intended life partners are: moral character, comradeship, affection, intelligence, interest in children, and good family stock. Such items as wealth, physical attractiveness, and social position are nowhere given very high rating. It would be interesting to know, of course, to what extent these men and women really follow these standards when they marry.

In several studies made by the writer among groups of Catholic students—college men and women and student-nurses—invariably highest mention was given to moral character, religion, and health; the lowest rating went to wealth, looks, and housekeeping ability; and, in between there were such items as similarity, intelligence, education and disposition.

In the following paragraphs some more detailed attention will be given the qualifications of similarity, character, attraction for home-life, wealth, health, and physical attractiveness.

Similarity.—In treating of tensions in family life, it was noted that differences of various kinds between mates give rise to friction and incompatibility in their home life. In the same manner, on the other hand, do similarities between mates tend to make for harmony and compatibility in the family. Cultural similarities between mates show themselves in the *mores,* folkways, aims, attitudes, ideas, and tastes of a people just as much as differences do, but, of course, with the contrary effect. The former make for compatibility, the latter for incompatibility. And usually, the greater the similarity, particularly with regard to the more essential and fundamental aims of life, the less need one look for discord, the more can one expect agreement and harmonious family life. Hence, in the selection of a mate, careful attention should be given to the matter of similarities and dissimilarities. There should be every assurance that a fair proportion of similarities exist between the two parties, and, on the other hand, dissimilarities should be carefully guarded against.

Likeness and unlikeness in individuals is to some extent due to inborn qualifications; more so, however, to cultural variation. Culture shapes a person's life pattern. When cultures are similar, life-patterns are much the same and one can expect conduct that is at least in fair accord and one can expect harmonious relations between husband and wife. The term "culture" is here used in the broad sense that extends to religious, educational, national, recreational, and other *mores* of a people.

Differences in religion and their effect on family life were given attention in a preceding chapter. Quite aside from a wholesome influence that a deeply religious spirit brings into a home circle, similarity of religion exerts an additional power by guaranteeing sameness of attitude with regard to all the more fundamental concerns of home life. Similarity of religion will make for similar attitudes towards marriage itself, for sameness of religion between parties to the marriage contract is very generally recognized as advantageous even outside the Church. And it is of the utmost importance, for though with mutual patience and the blessing of children, the lack of other common interests may not prove fatal or even seriously harmful to the family spirit, the lack of religious agreement commonly does leave a gap that cannot be bridged or even causes a conflict that will not down.

Sameness of race is closely akin to likeness of culture. Making due allowance for racial traits, the fact remains that individuals of different races differ largely because their racial cultures differ. And striking differences in nationality or race not only lead to disagreement, but they also penalize the children, causing them to suffer because of the conflicting cultures of the parents. Racial similarity will ordinarily make for sameness of family pattern and go far in producing an integrated home life.

A reasonable sameness of age is also to be kept in view if mating is to result in compatible family life. There is a very general tendency to do this. Commonly there are but a few years' difference at most between husband and wife. Yet there are exceptions; some will marry a mate of a strikingly different age because of a desire for self-aggrandizement or a wish to secure a fortune or a higher social position, and the like. In many of these cases, if marital happiness existed at all, it speedily came to grief. Similarity of age should make for unison in many different ways.

Again, common recreational interests, proportionate intellectual capacities, and educational opportunities, similar inclinations, and such like matters, all generally do much to foster a harmonious spirit in a family group by providing an attractive community of interests. Common likes and dislikes and enthusiasms, in general, help along, while dissimilarities of all kinds mean additional barriers that must be crossed before the land of familial peace and contentment is reached. Even in the case in which similarity might not actively lead to a happy marriage, certainly dissimilarity would not further the happiness of such a union.

Evidently a natural tendency exists for like to marry like. Data on hand show that husbands and wives resemble each other quite closely even in psychical traits; much more closely at least than would be the case if they mated altogether at random. Detailed studies have given convincing evidence to show that this is true in such matters as height, complexion, eye color, and such like. Thus, the tall man, for instance, commonly marries a woman who is above the average height. There are, of course, the usual exceptions to the rule. In the case of race, religion, social class—culture generally, in fact—it is more obvious that like tends to marry like. Yet this is not so commonly done today as in earlier times. As a result there has been increased family friction. In the days when future life-partners were brought up in the same village, attended the same school and church, and played with each other at recreation for many years, the marriage of like with like was almost automatically brought about. But more recently, and particularly in this country, inasmuch as it is the melting pot of many different cultural groups, this custom of the past has to no small extent been set aside. The mobile conditions of modern times have also given impetus to the latter tendency.

The courtship difficulties, pointed out before, have played a part. It is not altogether a simple matter to know whether cultural or other similarities exist between two individuals who have not been brought up together. Brief acquaintanceship away from home and family is not sufficient. Such selection of a mate would in all likelihood be based upon mere physical attraction or some trivial interest. But these things alone do not serve as a satisfactory basis for compatible home-life. They speedily wear off, and if no foundation of a more substantial nature exists trouble will not be far ahead. Compatibility or incompatibility are very much the result of similarity or dissimilarity in mates. A serious need of the family today is the discovery of these qualities before marriage is attempted. Intelligent mating demands it. And such mating is a fundamental requisite for an integrated home life.

There is, however, one important exception to the general tendency for like to marry like. It is not true, of course, with regard to sexual traits. Rather, does the normal man admire a womanly woman, while the normal woman is attracted by a manly man. Yet as a matter of fact, the tendency to-day is considerably away from this normal and natural attitude. On the part of many girls there is rather the unnatural and forced tendency to be "tomboys," to be "good sports," quite on the same footing with boys. Women, too, in considerable numbers must ape men, practically make men of themselves. In both cases they interpret equality as identity of the sexes. All such unnatural growths are of the hothouse variety and do harm while they last. In the heyday of youth and courtship such abnormalities may have a certain attraction on the part of both sexes. And they have their hazards too. But for permanent married life, the average man and woman rightly desire in the life-partner no small share of the characteristic and normal attractions of their respective sexes. Without them something essential will be lacking in the foundations of their home life. Sex incompatibility and other tensions may very easily result and prove detrimental to the family.

Good Character.—Another very essential qualification in a life-partner is good character. The term is here used to include both disposition and moral character; or, in other words, temperament and even attitudes, as well as ethical standards. Certainly a person of steady and reliable disposition is to be preferred to a mate who is unstable, changeable, impulsive, temperamental. An individual with noble ideals and high moral standards undoubtedly makes a more desirable mate than one of low ideals and standards. The intelligent person would naturally select a mate adorned with virtue or good habits in preference to one not so adorned or even branded with vice and evil habits. Good character both in the sense of general disposition and moral uprightness, deserves most careful attention when one comes to the important task of selecting a life mate.

That the vast majority of people view the matter in this light, is evident from a number of surveys. Though some, through an impulsive infatuation or for other reasons, may never really carry out their own notions in the matter, those, in general, who give the matter thought invariably rank unimpeachable character and good disposition high among the qualifications suggested as desirable in a mate. For instance, in answer to the question, "What type of a girl do you want to marry?" asked in the Religious Survey of Notre Dame University quoted before, 203 students mentioned "Good Character," as compared with 188, for instance, who mentioned religion, and 80 who answered "a homemaker." Good character, of course, in the inclusive sense of disposition and moral character, is very closely bound up with religion. A deeply religious spirit, embracing a sense of loyalty to faith and fidelity to religious duty, a sense of eternal values and of reverence and respect towards God, and the things of God, will, without fail, show itself in character and make itself felt in the most wholesome fashion in family life. A lack of religious spirit will only too frequently be accompanied by an unreliable disposition, by lack of sense of responsibility even with regard to most sacred duties and obligations.

Perhaps no two persons have altogether the same notion as to what is desirable and undesirable in the character make-up of a mate. One can, however, readily point out a number of outstanding traits that all will agree should be looked at askance in settling the question of a life-partner. There is, for instance, selfishness. This is a key trait, touching upon life's motives generally, and coloring all of one's activities. Family life so consistently calls for mutual sacrifice that the selfish person lacks one of the most fundamental requirements for peaceful and contented family life. A reasonable amount of unselfishness is absolutely a *sine qua non* condition for the normal functioning of home life. Again, sobriety, particularly with regard to drink, is altogether essential. Inebriety invariably keeps the home-life and family spirit in constant peril. And jealousy and over-sensitiveness, or a carping and quarrelsome spirit, a fault-finding and complaining nature, augur no good for the future life of the home. As far as the fundamental virtue of chastity is concerned, the only sound view is the single standard—no moral lapse for either man or woman. Altogether fundamental on the part of husband and wife is self-control. Without it they will not be able to meet the many trying situations that arise in married life; unhappiness will be inevitable. With due self-control, however, contentment is altogether possible in spite of the unfavorable factors that cannot be entirely avoided because of the very processes of life.

Attraction for Home Life.—For a really satisfying married life, both husband and wife must possess an attraction for home life. Hence, in selecting a mate, both man and woman should diligently keep this trait in view. The notion should include interest in home-life and home-making in general, and a desire for offspring and willingness to rear a family. A recent writer has expressed this entire home spirit by the word "domesticity"; and he includes in the term "pride in one's home and contentment therein, love for and willingness to rear children, appreciation of home-centered life with mate and offspring as the heart of that life."[2]

On the average the studies[3] made to sound out the views of men and women concerning the desirable traits of a life-partner, placed considerable stress upon the quality of domesticity. Particularly did they show that the man emphatically wants a wife who will also be a mother of children. Quite as unfailingly did the women insist that a husband must have love for children, interest in them, and ability to care for them as well as the means to support a wife. This is, of course, a very healthy attitude, the only one in fact that is in accord with the purposes of marriage. It has its foundations deep in nature. Marriage sympathy must center very largely in children. Mutual interests of husband and wife in their children

[2] Cooper, J. M., *Religion Outlines for Colleges*, Course IV, p. 78.
[3] Cf. Reference No. 1.

are far stronger and more lasting than most other common interests between them. Children make the home attractive. They make married life worth-while. Hence the prospective mate's attitude on this matter may well be weighed before marriage is contracted.

No matter what the attitude may be of those who have given the matter some thought, the fact is that attraction for home-life has suffered in modern times. In not a few cases the attraction is away from home rather than towards it. Even such a matter as the lack of housekeeping ability may hinder the development of a spirit of domesticity; it may even create an antipathy for it. The distorted and unbalanced feminist view that anything that smacks of domesticity also smacks of Egyptian bondage, tends to tear down more wholesome notions in the minds of some women.

Many factors in the social system of the times work against the cultivation of an interest in home-life. Society is very mobile. People are very much on the go and away from home. Attractions outside the home are being multiplied. There are clubs and teas and bridge games. Work and recreation outside the home before marriage mean many social contacts and interests that may make the more confining life within the home after marriage seem dull and uninviting. In efforts to stabilize family life considerable attention may well be given to fostering domesticity among the younger people to-day. Considerable attention should unfailingly be given to a prospective mate's attitude toward home-making and home-life.

Wealth and Income.—If the remark of the irate young husband at the breakfast table, "I wish I had some of the biscuits my mother used to bake," suggests a lack of domesticity or inability on the part of the youthful wife to prepare a wholesome and tasty meal, the retort of the latter, "And I wish I had some of the 'dough' my father used to make," points to an important qualification on the part of the husband, the ability satisfactorily to support a family. Again, if there is some truth in the saying that the way to a man's heart is through his stomach, there is also some truth in the contention that the way to a woman's heart is through the pocketbook. The qualification of domesticity is perhaps more necessary on the part of the woman; that of ability to support a family, on the part of the man. However, the lack of either attribute in either mate may lead to family discord.

The economic factor is a considerable source of tension in modern family life. To choose a mate exclusively, or even primarily, for reasons of wealth, is to invite speedy disillusionment. This is recognized by the vast majority of those who have given the matter thought. In the studies concerning the desirable qualifications of a mate afore-mentioned, very little heed was given the subject of wealth in the sense of affluent riches. Of course, for many to aim high would but be to bar themselves from all prospect of marriage, since only 15 to 20 per cent of all wage-earners in the United States get as much as $2,000 a year, and less than 7 or 8 per cent are getting $3,000 or more.[4] It is true these percentages would be somewhat higher if limited to male wage-earners, since very frequently their wages run higher than those of women breadwinners in the same kind of work.

The opposite extreme to marrying for money, consists in rushing recklessly into marriage without the safely guaranteed prospect of a reasonable income. A certain minimum is altogether essential for satisfactory and contented family life. The fact is, however, that there are many prospective husbands who are not getting even the estimated minimum of $1,500 to $2,000 a year, commonly held to be necessary for a family of five. But it is also true that a family does not start with five members. Hence attention should be given to prospective as well as to present income. "Prospective income," writes Dr. Cooper,[5] "is perhaps even more important than actual income at the time of marriage. Provided there be such

[4] *National Wealth and Income.* Report by the Federal Trade Commission (Government Printing Office, Washington).

[5] Cooper, J. M., op. cit, p. 67.

reasonable prospects of fair advancement, the couple are usually better off if they have to start life under the necessity of a good deal of very careful planning in order to make both ends meet. Such mutual planning both educates the couple in the use of money and brings them into closer union and comradeship. There is moreover more contentment and happiness if there is prospect of financial betterment as time goes on—which is another reason why it is unwise to postpone marriage until maximum or near-maximum income is reached.''

If either party is unwilling to start the home at a standard somewhat lower than the one enjoyed within the parents' home, it is quite likely that there is a something lacking in both the love and character make-up of the individual that bodes no good for future wedded happiness. It is a wise precaution to study during courtship days the attitude of a prospective mate with regard to money matters and to talk financial matters over very thoroughly and frankly before marriage is contracted. Much family tension that now results from financial trouble in the home might so be avoided.

Physical Health.—Among further qualifications that deserve special mention is that of health, both physical and mental. Good physical health ranks very high among the desirable qualifications of a mate. More frequently than any other single qualification is good health rated first in importance in different surveys that have touched upon the subject of desirable attributes of a life-partner. And it is rightly rated high, for poor health on the part of either spouse can hamper the normal functions of the family in many different ways. Thus because of the close relationship between good health and a compatible temperament, poor health may readily lead to much incompatibility. Continual close contact within the family group may only exaggerate the difficulty occasioned by poor health. Again poor health may lead to financial worries that will lessen the family peace. It may even involve utter inability to carry on the normal functions of the family. An invalid wife will commonly be able to fulfil but few of the requirements of a mate. The procreation and rearing of a family that is physically, mentally and morally fit may be entirely out of the question. Hence the desirability of good health in a marital partner cannot be gainsaid. Exceptions can, of course, be pointed to in which the husband or wife was handicapped with prolonged illness and delicate health and yet marriage proved altogether successful and happy. But far more commonly does poor health serve to multiply difficulties in the effort of building up a successful and satisfying home life, and it at times even makes such an undertaking quite impossible. There is no need of laboring the point. It is very generally recognized.

A little detailed attention to some of the specific diseases that tend to render happy family life problematical may prove of more benefit. No pretension is made at discussing all these diseases. Only brief mention will be made of some of those which are outstanding. The question whether a particular disease is hereditary or not deserves attention because this directly concerns possible offspring of the marriage union.

(1) The Social Diseases.[6]—Of the social diseases, gonorrhea and syphilis are well known to carry with them serious consequences for married life. Their frequency to-day, their contagious character, their quiescent and insidious nature, and their undoubted devastating effects upon the family and its members should make them a matter of deepest concern to those contemplating marriage.

Both diseases are contagious. Gonorrhea is, in fact, one of the most common of the contagious diseases. And syphilis can only be said to be second to it as the greatest enemy of marriage. Both diseases are, in the vast majority of cases, acquired through immoral contact and then perhaps, in turn, carried to innocent mates in marriage. A promiscuous life means almost certain exposure to venereal disease.

A particularly grave aspect of the disease is its quiescent nature. Many who believe themselves cured of the consequences of earlier vicious practices may discover their fatal error only after months and even years of married life, and after untold harm has been effected. Once acquired, the social diseases are very difficult of absolute cure.

---

[6] Popenoe, P., *The Conservation of the Family*, Chs. VI, VII.

Even granting that some estimates of the extent of the social diseases are set too high, there can still be no doubt that the social evils are among the surest destroyers of happy family life. The testimony of physicians is so universal that there is no room for reasonable doubt in the matter. In themselves the diseases are very grave and their effects are both manifold and serious. Perhaps the worst feature about them is that the chief sufferers usually are innocent children. Sickness, general debility, miscarriages, barrenness, insanity, and premature death are among the chief effects of this scourge of our civilization.

The taint communicated by an infected husband to an innocent wife may work with far more deadly effect in the latter than in the former. Gynecologists know well today the terrible price paid by thousands of innocent wives for the "fast life" of their husbands. Why, in so many cases, the strong and healthy bride becomes the invalid wife who is never to know the joy of children of her own, is no longer a mystery to science. In fact, it is no longer a mystery to the average man or woman. Possibly half of the cases of sterility are due to gonorrhea. At times it is only after the birth of the first child that the infection gets into the mother's womb and does its deadly work. Many a female operation has as its real cause one of the social diseases, though the fact may be hidden behind some such innocent term as "honeymoon appendicitis" or even some high-sounding technical term.

Syphilis is a frequent cause of miscarriages and still births. Probably 75 per cent of the offspring of syphilitic parents die either before birth or within the first year following.[7] Those who survive are the syphilitics, some born blind, others weak in mind and body, never well though they may not develop the disease in its most virulent form.

---

[7] Popenoe, P., *The Conservation of the Family*, p. 93.

All these results of the social diseases harm family life as well as the individual members of the group. And today, when the causes of these evils are more generally known, the family bond frequently breaks under the strain. "In earlier times," writes Goodsell,[8] "when wives were almost wholly ignorant of these facts, the disastrous results of their husbands' vicious living, past or present, did not lead to permanent alienations. It is true that in the past many married women gradually became chronic invalids whose lives were a drag upon themselves and their families. But in a large number of cases, probably neither the wife nor the husband was aware of the true source of the trouble and so their mutual affection was not destroyed. Yet the invalidism of the wife, combined with her sterility or incapacity to bear healthy children, must have been a heavy strain upon the husband's affection and happiness, especially when he was quite ignorant of the fact that he alone was to blame. Such marriages must have been fruitful in blasted hopes if nothing worse. But nowadays, when books and journals treat these subjects with freedom and in the spirit of science, few young women are as ignorant of the facts concerning prostitution and disease as were their mothers of a generation past. Having eaten the bitter fruit of knowledge, they will, when married, better understand the ills that may attack them and their children. If these evils come upon them, who will dare to prophesy that the marriage bond will hold fast under the strain? Probably in some cases, love will survive even this supreme wrong; but in many other instances disease and its shameful cause, once discovered, will bring about the complete disruption of the families concerned."

As a remedy for this situation the same writer urges as altogether necessary one standard of personal purity and the teaching of the ideal of absolute monogamy from the early days of youth on. Meantime, men and women should take care to assure themselves that they and their prospective mates are physically fit for marriage. And, incidentally, this should be attended to before betrothal. If an individual waits until after betrothal and then finds something seriously wrong, the only alternatives are to break the engagement, thus causing suspicion or injury to the feelings of the other partner, or going ahead and letting all concerned suffer the consequences. Because of the unquestioned prevalence of the social diseases and the difficulty in modern life of knowing the past of an intended mate, the sensible thing to do is to insist upon definite medical assurance of physical fitness. A custom of voluntarily interchanging medical certificates before marriage would undoubtedly be of great benefit to individual and family alike. Some States have passed laws to help this situation but they have been of little value. Perhaps their main benefit has been their educational value.

---

[8] Goodsell, U., *The Family as a Social and Educational Institution,* pp. 476–477.

(2) **Tuberculosis.**—Tuberculosis is another disease that is very widespread and that deserves consideration on the part of those contemplating marriage. It is true that the treatment of consumption has so vastly improved that very many individuals who have had active tuberculosis may marry to-day without serious hazard to themselves or to their offspring. It is well to note, however, that one of the unfortunate aspects of the disease is that pregnancy tends to aggravate an active case. Hence, since parents have obligations not only to themselves, but also to their offspring as well, a person who has an active case of consumption should not marry until cured and until sufficient time has elapsed to build up physically and prove that a relapse is not likely to recur. Even then care as well as due precaution should be taken to preserve vigorous health by means of a wholesome diet, a sufficiency of fresh air and plentiful exercise.

As far as we know, the disease is not inherited. However, certain individuals and families seemingly cannot resist the disease as well as others. And this lack of power of resistance is seemingly transmissible. It would be a wise precaution not to marry into families in which there are many deaths from the disease since that would be a probable indication of a weak power of resistance to the disease in that particular family.

(3) **Cancer.**—Cancer is one of the serious diseases and is apparently increasing considerably. In many cases, however, it only puts in its appearance in later life and is consequently not so much a matter of concern to young people contemplating marriage. Whether or not a tendency to cancer is hereditary, is disputed. To marry into a family, however, in which there is a heavy mortality from cancer would seem to be taking a big risk. This would particularly be the case if the disease existed in both families concerned.

(4) **Diabetes.**—Diabetes is common enough to deserve at least passing mention. A diabetic person is a poor health prospect and must always give the greatest care to his health. The disease is particularly dangerous on the part of the woman. It is recognized that the tendency to diabetes is hereditary.

The best practical criterion for judging the soundness of a family stock is the longevity of its members. One is not likely to go far wrong, as far as health is concerned, in choosing a mate from a vigorous and long-lived family.

Mental Health.—As far as the mental diseases are concerned, the chief warning signals are insanity, feeble-mindedness, and epilepsy. Insanity in an individual should, of course, absolutely bar marriage. Such a person cannot possibly fulfil the obligations of the married life. Moreover, insanity in a family stock should be a warning signal to those who are seeking a mate. It is to no small extent inherited as a stock taint and a tendency to insanity anywhere in the family may be transmitted to the offspring. An exceptional case found in an otherwise sound stock would rather suggest that the insanity was acquired. Conclusions must be drawn with care in this particular field. There is still much need for further scientific research here.

Marked feeble-mindedness is another undesirable mental qualification in a mate. One would hardly care to marry a person incapable mentally of shouldering the ordinary responsibilities of family life. Yet a person with marked feeble-mindedness can not undertake such duties in an intelligent way. This, again, is another warning signal in the field of psychic heredity. Estimates suggest that about 50 per cent of the cases of feeble-mindedness result from poor mental heredity and 50 per cent from disease or accident. In many an individual case it is difficult to know whether the feeble-mindedness is hereditary or acquired. The latter would be the case, for instance, if it resulted from a difficult birth. If, however, it is fairly common in a family there is good enough reason to believe that it is a hereditary taint and carries with it the danger of transmission. It may crop out as the result of a recessive trait even in a mentally normal offspring because of his origin from a tainted stock. In this field, too, there is still much need for scientific research and for more definite and trustworthy information.

Epilepsy also is very commonly inherited. Hence it is altogether advisable that a competent psychiatrist be consulted before seriously contemplating marriage with a member of an epileptic stock.

Physical Attractiveness.—Physical attractiveness, or beauty, in form and looks is not a trait to be despised. But it must go hand in hand with other more substantial qualifications such as character and virtue. To look merely to physical attractiveness in selecting a mate would be foolhardy. Beauty passes away and, standing alone, would lend little support against the storms of family life. Few in fact have rated beauty very high in comparison with other qualifications of a life-partner. As far as beauty in its proper sense is concerned, it is worthy of note that it is largely dependent upon health.

Striking a Reasonable Balance.—No individual will be found who possesses all desirable qualifications in a mate in the highest degree. To set one's ideal too high; to pass up one prospective mate after another because, over and above many valuable qualities, there are present a few drawbacks would likely end in not marrying at all. A few slight defects must not be allowed to outweigh a number of genuine merits. On the other hand, the warning is also in place that disillusionment will in all likelihood follow if one pays heed to only a few more or less attractive traits and overlooks the lack of many more desirable and fundamental qualities. One must at least seek to strike a happy medium in the matter. It is true that the qualifications mentioned are not all of equal importance. A deep sense of religion, for instance, assuring a spirit of endurance and a sense of duty and responsibility, will undoubtedly make family life quite possible even when a considerable number of other desirable qualifications are lacking. The mere presence, on the other hand, of a few such attributes as wealth and beauty can hardly be expected to ensure such a result. The greater the number of desirable traits on the part of both partners, the more satisfying can they expect their home-life to be. While the aim must not be so high as to remain beyond the possibility of realization, it should not rest satisfied with a mating that merely gives assurance of somehow keeping the two within the marriage bond; it should seek the construction of a smoothly functioning and thoroughly organized family. Such an ideal requires pre-marital preparation. It requires a selection of a mate in which the head is not over-balanced by the heart. In short, a careful and intelligent selection of a mate is one of the most promising ways of assuring a higher and more integrated family life.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. What other qualifications of a mate can you suggest?
2. What traits of character are desirable in a prospective mate?
3. Do you think it is common for mates to be altogether harmoniously attuned to each other?
4. Can a home succeed if love is missing but all other important qualifications are present?

5. Should choosing one's life mate be a matter more of the mind or more of the heart?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bundesen, H. N., "Everybody's Problem," *Bulletin of Chicago Health Dept.*, Dec. 6, 1924.
Cooper, J. M., *Religion Outlines for Colleges,* Course IV, Ch. 6.
Edson, N. W., *Choosing a Home Partner.*
Gerrard, T. J., *Marriage and Parenthood,* Ch. IV.
Popenoe, P., *Modern Marriage.*
———, *The Conservation of the Family,* Chs. I, II.
Ross, J. E., "What is Love?" (*Paulist Press Pamphlet.*)

CHAPTER XVI

LEGAL SAFEGUARDS OF MARRIAGE

Both the Church and the modern State have erected defences around marriage and have hedged it in with many safeguards. Viewed as a civil contract marriage is subjected as to its civil effects to the civil law. Viewed as a sacrament it is subject to the ecclesiastical law. In safeguarding the very entrance to family life, such legislation can undoubtedly be of considerable benefit to the modern home. In this chapter brief attention will be given to the laws of both Church and State.

THE CHURCH'S MARRIAGE LAWS[1]

The historical evolution of the Church's marriage laws has already been given attention. The present status of some of her laws will be considered here. Because of space, all of them cannot be entered into. Some are applicable only in a limited number of instances. Attention will be directed rather towards those laws that are more commonly called into use. No church law is without its particular purpose and usefulness.

Investigation and the Publication of the Banns.—The present legislation on this matter is nothing but the Tridentine regulation with a few modifications which experience showed to be necessary. The banns must be published on three successive Sundays or feast days of obligation during mass or any service at which there is a large attendance of people. Besides this oral publication, another method is permissible. The bishop may, in his territory, substitute the public posting of the names of the contracting parties on the doors of the parish or other church. The names must remain posted over at least a period of eight days and must include two days of obligation. It is the grave duty of the faithful to reveal to the pastor or bishop of the place before the marriage is celebrated, any impediments they may know. At least three days should pass after the last publication of the banns before the marriage rite is performed, unless some plausible reason dictates otherwise. While the banns undoubtedly still give the publicity sought thereby, in vast numbers of small parishes and more stable groups of the world, they are hardly as effective in the large parishes of our modern cities. Other regulations must help to provide information in these cases; above all, greater care and watchfulness is essential on the part of those who officiate at marriages in these places. The regulations of the Church with regard to the investigation as well as the publication of the banns are a very considerable safeguard of marriage and of the home. Particularly do they accomplish much good in preventing hasty and ill-advised marriages.

---

[1] Ayrinhac, H. A., *Marriage Legislation in the New Code;* Bachofer, O. S. B., C. A., *A Commentary on Canon Law*, Vol. V; Petrovits, J. J., *New Church Law on Matrimony.*

Freedom of Consent.—In her present-day legislation the Church makes specific mention of the usual obstacles to free and valid consent: ignorance, error, simulation, and violence, or fear. In the case of ignorance, for example, she insists that it is necessary that the contracting parties are at least not lacking in the knowledge that marriage is the permanent union of man and woman for the procreation of children. Without such knowledge free consent to the essentials of the marriage contract are taken to be impossible.

Again, error about the person with whom the contract is made invalidates the marriage. Such ignorance would in reality amount to an error concerning the essential object of the consent. Error about the quality of the person, even if it is the cause of the contract, invalidates marriage only when it amounts to error about the person, or, if a free person marries one whom he believes to be free also, but who, on the contrary, is in a state of servitude properly so-called.

So also does fiction or simulation nullify the marriage contract. An example of this would be a mock marriage, or a marriage ceremony gone through merely in sport.

With regard to violence or fear the Church law reads; "Marriage is null also when it is contracted because of violence or grave fear, caused by an external agent, unjustly to free himself from which, one is compelled to choose marriage. No other fear, even if it would give cause to the contract, entails the nullity of marriage." (C. 1087 of *New Code.*)

Closely akin to this is the Church's impediment of abduction. The present law reads: "Between the abductor and the woman abducted with a view to marriage there can be no marriage as long as the abducted person is in the abductor's power. If the abducted woman, having been separated from the abductor and restored to a place of safety, consents to have him for a husband, the impediment ceases. In regard to the nullity of marriage we must assimilate to abduction the violent detention of a woman, when, namely, a man violently detains her, with a view to marriage, in the place where she resides or where she has come of her own accord." (C. 1074.)

Minimum Marriageable Age and Parental Consent to Marriage.—The Church also regulates the minimum marriageable age by her canon law. According to the present law, in order that a marriage may be valid, the Church requires that a male be seventeen years old and a female fifteen. This is a higher age requirement than that of some of the States and somewhat lower than that of others. It must be borne in mind, of course, that the Church legislates for all climes and all peoples. Certainly there is nothing in the practice of the Church in this country, for example, that encourages marriages at even this minimum age. The contrary is rather the case. In fact, her legislation on parental consent would seem very generally to encourage a higher age limit.

While the Church upholds the right of children to marry without the consent of their parents and condemns the doctrine that parents have the power to annul the marriages of their children, she at the same time affirms the duties of children towards their parents. She insists that the relations existing between them demand that the children consult their parents. By this she protects the children in their youthful thoughtlessness and upholds a precept of the natural law: the duty of prudence and of reverence to parents. The general canon law of the Church regarding the marriage of minors without the knowledge or consent of their parents, reads: "The pastor shall strongly dissuade minors from marrying if they (the parents) do not know of the intended marriage or are reasonably opposed to it. If the said minors cannot be dissuaded from their purpose, the pastor shall not assist at the marriage without previously consulting the bishop of the diocese." (C. 1034.) Before consulting the bishop the pastor should dispassionately hear the objections on the part of the parents in order to communicate them to the bishop.

A reasonable objection on the part of the parents would be, for instance, disgrace, dissension, scandal, or notable material loss that would follow the marriage. Unreasonable objections would be such as are inspired by personal dislike or political differences, or, again, those that would be based on idle gossip or mere sentiment. In practice, the law refers to minors, that is, to legitimate children under age who have not been emancipated. According to ecclesiastical law, both males and females under twenty-one years of age are minors.

Publicity and Ceremonial Rite.—The Church forbids clandestine marriage. She demands that the marriage be publicly contracted and also made a subject of official record. Without introducing any substantial change in the Tridentine legislation aforementioned, a decree that went into effect at Easter, 1908, regulated the form of marriage in a manner better adapted to present mobile conditions. Its wisdom and beneficial effects were so well established by an experience of eight or nine years that it was embodied in the *New Code* and promulgated in 1918 with but very little modification.

In content, this last law of the Church on the subject demands for validity of the marriage that in the case of a Catholic or mixed marriage it take place before the pastor of the parish in which the parties are married live, or before the bishop of the diocese, or before some priest delegated by the one or the other. Moreover, this rite must always be performed in the presence of two witnesses. In case the pastor or bishop or delegated priest cannot be reached without grave inconvenience or hardship, then the marriage may be validly contracted before witnesses alone either where there is danger of death, or even where there is no such danger but where it is reasonably foreseen that no properly qualified priest can be reached within a month.

Like the Tridentine decree, therefore, the new law demands for the validity of marriage the presence of the parish priest as the official representative of the Church and that of two witnesses. Formerly, however, the law was personal in part, while now it is exclusively territorial. It is not the pastor or ordinary of the parties whose presence is necessary for the validity, but the pastor or ordinary of the place in which the marriage is celebrated. A parish priest is not at liberty to marry those who do not reside in his parish, nor may he go outside his parish limits to perform a marriage without explicit personal delegation from the pastor of the parish in which the marriage takes place, or from the bishop of the diocese. This regulation tends both to fix responsibility and to promote efficiency in administrative work of the Church.

Looking with disfavor upon secret marriages, the Church, together with Catholic people generally, also takes an unfriendly attitude toward elopements and towards evasive or runaway marriages. It is true there may be cases in which it is altogether fitting and justifiable that the marriage take place in a different parish, or even in a different city than that in which the parties reside. Arrangements for such can easily be made. Of course, due permission from the parish priest of the bride must be sought and obtained. The "double license plan," advocated in the case of the civil law by some, for evasive out-of-State marriages is similar to this in substance if not in detail. According to this plan a license is demanded from the home district of the woman for any out-of-State marriage. Such cases should be only the exceptions to the general rule that marriages should take place in the home parish.

Moreover, when both parties are Catholic, the proper place for the marriage is the parish church. It is the earnest wish of the Church that the nuptial mass always accompany the reception of the sacrament of matrimony. It is not only a holy and sacred thing but also an outstanding event in the lives of those who receive the sacrament. Hence the ceremonial observed and the publicity given by due observance of the Church's ritual is altogether in place. Still, while in general the Church favors all religious solemnity at marriages, her own law forbids such solemnization of the rite during certain seasons of the ecclesiastical year. Thus, between Ash Wednesday and Easter Sunday inclusive, the solemn nuptial blessing, given during the mass at other times of the year, is omitted and the wedding itself should be carried through without elaborate display. Another such forbidden time is the season of advent. The reason for this is the penitential spirit of these particular seasons of the ecclesiastical year.

Marriage Records.—The Church has also long legislated with regard to the keeping of marriage records. Such records are of vital importance in many kinds of moral and legal situations that may arise. They may even become necessary for the protection of fundamental human rights. If looseness and confusion are introduced into matrimonial records, grave injustices readily follow in marriage itself.

To-day the Church not only requires the ordinary marriage record as has been her custom for centuries, but she also demands by her canon law that the parties to the marriage contract show their testimonials of baptism. The fact of their marriage is, in turn, indicated in the baptismal register. The reason for this precaution of the Church is again founded in the mobility of modern conditions. It serves in many instances to protect individuals against such as might attempt marriage with them in spite of some hidden impediment that stood in the way.

Spiritual relationship is something altogether peculiar to the members of the Church. It arises from baptism and exists between the minister or the sponsor on the one side and the person baptized on the other. The reason for it is primarily religious rather than strictly social. This is also the case with canonical prohibition of marriage of one with solemn vows or the equivalent thereof in a religious community. Attempted marriage by such would be both illicit and invalid. With regard to legal relationship through adoption, the Church follows the laws of the particular State.

In all her legislation the Church ever has at heart the interest of the couples themselves and the good of society and religion in general. Seeking by her legal defenses to erect possible safeguards around marriage and thus to ensure its validity, the Church has done much to advance the happiness of home life and to help build successful families.

MARRIAGE AND THE STATE

In medieval Europe matrimony was regarded as a sacrament by the people generally and consequently was regulated almost entirely by the Church. With the Protestant Revolt, however, marriage came to be looked upon as a mere civil contract by many and the State began more and more to regulate it. To-day we find both ecclesiastical and civil legislation for marriage in this country. The State laws regulate the marriages of those not reached in any way by the Canon Law of the Church. Members of the Church, on the other hand, are bound by their own church laws and also observe the civil law with regard to the civil effects of marriage.

Not having the long years and even centuries of experience, and the historic background that the canon law of the

Church has, American civil marriage legislation is not yet so thorough as the ecclesiastical law. Particularly unsatisfactory in this country is the lack of uniformity among the laws of the different States. Inadequate laws in one State may considerably hurt the effectiveness of better laws in another State; for instance, by opening up the possibilities of evasion. It is undoubtedly true that in early colonial days, when marriage was still to a considerable extent in the hands of the different Church groups and many of the old laws of the mother church were still used by them, regulations were really more satisfactory in many ways than has been the case in more recent years. There seems to be a worth-while movement on foot to-day, however, to improve civil marriage legislation. In 1927, for example, an exceptional amount of activity was shown in this neglected field.[2] In that year 138 legislative bills on marriage were introduced in various State legislatures and twenty-six of the better ones were passed. This is double the number ever introduced in any previous year.

Colonial Marriage Laws.—The early American colonies made provision for specific marriage regulations. Thus their laws demanded: due notice of intention to marry, clear evidence of parental consent, celebration of the marriage by a duly authorized person, and the keeping of marriage records by town or county clerk or registrar.

Several different methods of making known to the public the intention to marry were in vogue in the colonies. They could not, however, all be used indiscriminately. The commonest method of publicity was the old system of the Church: the publishing of the banns of marriage three times in some public place. It was customary in the Southern colonies to publish the banns on three consecutive Sundays in the parish churches. But parties intending to marry were also privileged to obtain a license from the governor and later on from the county court, instead of publishing the banns.

---

[2] Richmond, M. E., "The Concern of the Community with Marriage," *The Family*, December, 1927, p. 245.

In the Middle Colonies there were a number of variations in the laws regulating the announcement of intention to marry. In Maryland either banns or license were required. In Pennsylvania neither of these two methods was used but, instead, a notice had to be posted on the court- or meeting-house door, a month preceding the marriage ceremony. Moreover, a certificate had to be secured from reputable persons to show that no impediments stood in the way of the marriage. In New Jersey three publications of the banns in church or posting of notice for two weeks was required. The so-called "Duke's Laws" of New York required either banns or license.

Throughout the New England Colonies the law required either banns or posting in some public place of notice of intention to marry.

Various other provisions were carefully made for the regulation of marriage in the colonies. In fact, considerable pains were taken to safeguard marriage and the various regulations of the time compared very favorably with those found in the different States to-day. "A review of colonial legislation with respect to marriage," states Goodsell,[3] "gives clear evidence that the first settlers made every attempt to safeguard the institution of matrimony and to prevent thoughtless persons from entering the contract carelessly and without due formality. Parental consent, given to the town or county clerk personally or in writing, was everywhere required; due notice of the marriage by the banns or posting or, in default of banns, by license from the governor, was demanded in all the colonies; the solemnization of marriage was regulated by law; and, finally, registration of the marriage in town or county clerk's office, or in colonies where the Church of England was established, by the parish clerk, was a universal requirement. In none of the colonies was 'self-marriage' (incorrectly called common-law marriage) in which the parties took each other for husband and wife without the presence of magistrate or clergyman sanctioned by law. Even in Pennsylvania the law of 1693 required that one of the twelve witnesses to the ceremony should be a justice of the peace. In all other colonies marriage by magistrate or clergyman or (in frontier districts of Virginia) by a layman licensed by the courts was inflexibly demanded by law. Yet there can be little doubt that 'self-marriage,' contrary to legal provisions did occur from time to time throughout the colonies. In such cases except where the law expressly declared the marraige void, the offenders were liable to punishment for contracting an *illegal* marriage, but their union was not declared *invalid*. Thus the old medieval distinction between marriages contrary to law and those which were null and void from the beginning seems to have crept into colonial legislative practice. Even in the colonies where illegal marriages were also declared invalid the statute was probably itself invalid because not in accordance with the laws of England."

---

[3] Goodsell, W., *The Family as a Social and Educational Institution*, pp 376–377.

The Requirement of Advance Notice To-day.—Advance notice of intention to marry is far less commonly required by civil law to-day than was the case in colonial days. After the abandonment of the old system of publishing banns, there was a considerable interregnum between that procedure and the present arrangement requiring a few days' advance notice. Even today the latter is only found in a limited number of States, the others requiring no notice in advance whatever. "In 1927 only twelve States had provisions that were regarded as advance notice laws, and only eight of these States . . . had laws worthy of the name, for three of the twelve placed the interval of delay *after* license issuance, and one other State confined advance notice to candidates under twenty-one. Even so, one of these eight requires but a two-day interval between application and issuance with a further interval of one day between issuance and ceremony."[4] The license should be issued only after the time of the advance notice has expired. Issuing it before opens the door to abuses that may render the regulation altogether useless. For instance, an official might perform the marriage immediately and then pre-date the certificate.

---

[4] Richmond, M. E. and Hall, F. S., op. cit., pp. 131–132.

These provisions for notice for marriage are helpful in preventing both hasty and illegal unions. Thus, in a number of cases in which the law applies, the advance notice has had the effect of bringing certain definite disqualifications to light, such as the existence of racial disqualifications. The greatest value of the notice, however, is undoubtedly the fact that it prevents hasty marriages by giving the opportunity to the more thoughtful ones who are contemplating marriage to think matters over more seriously and not rush into marriage on the spur of the moment and under a brief spell of infatuation. It would be too much to expect hasty marriage to prove satisfactory and happy.

Both these effects—the prevention of fraud and the opportunity for second thought before marriage—are of great importance to the individual and to the State. But these laws can not prove very effective while marriage-market towns and other similar forms of exploitation continue to flourish. Matters would undoubtedly be bettered if all States had laws demanding advance notice. Until that is the case, a ''double license plan'' would be helpful.[5] This would require that when two persons from outside a State wish to marry they must bring with them a license issued in the home district of the woman candidate, as proof that the marriage would be sanctioned by the laws of the State in which she has a residence. This is much the same as the ecclesiastical requirement that any out-of-parish marriage must be sanctioned by the pastor of the bride. This advance notice procedure differs from the system of banns of the past particularly in its reliance for effectiveness upon due diligence and discretion on the part of the license issuers, rather than upon publicity. The Church's laws seek to keep both these advantages.

---

[5] Ibid.

The Minimum Marriageable Age.—Mention has already been made of the large number of child marriages in this country. Facts regarding these marriages and their social aspects have been rather insistently brought to the attention of the public recently with the result that the laws regulating this matter have improved somewhat. Pennsylvania, for example, raised the minimum age of girls from twelve to sixteen years in 1927. Minnesota advanced her minimum from fifteen to sixteen years in the same year. In 1926 New York raised hers from 12 to 14.[6] Over a third of all the States have now adopted the 16 year minimum of age for the marriage of girls; a fourth of the States, however, still lag behind and cling to the old minimum of 12 for girls and 14 for boys.[7] Hence there is still much room for improvement in this field of marriage legislation. Very commonly, to-day as in the past, there is a difference of two years between the minimum marriageable age required for girls and that required for boys. This has its basis in nature itself. There is a difference in the rate of physical development of the sexes. Girls mature about two years earlier than boys.

There are, of course, sound reasons for a minimum marriageable age. On the biological side, the argument against very early marriages is, that marriage and parenthood are not advantageous until the bodily frame has had time to store up a reserve of strength and vigor that is not attainable during the more rapid periods of growth. Yet even biologists do not speak for very late marriages. In fact they enumerate many reasons that should urge the practice of reasonably early marriages. They can see little good in the practice of delaying marriage as long as is done in certain groups, as for instance, the professional classes.

---

[6] Richmond, M. E., op. cit., p. 245.

[7] Richmond, M. E. and Hall, F. S., op. cit., pp. 131–132.

The social argument against unreasonably early marriages is significant too. Rearing a family in our complex civilization is not an undertaking for a child. Our cultural life is much more complicated than a generation ago and consequently the task of training children is greater than formerly. Moreover, modern conditions of mobility and migration tend to leave newly wedded couples much more to their own resources than was the case under the more stable conditions of the past. Perhaps there never was a civilization in which the rearing of a family was left so exclusively to the two parties founding the home as is the case in our modern urban centers. Such conditions are difficult even for adults. It is not surprising that these conditions particularly tend to cause disorganization and even total disintegration in child marriage homes.

Not only is the civil law similar to that of the Church in requiring a minimum marriageable age, but also in requiring parental consent for the marriage of children of a certain age. Thus the States that still have a very low minimum marriageable age usually require parental consent for children who marry between the ages of 12 and 18 or 21 in the case of girls, and between 14 and 21 in the case of boys. In States with a 16 year minimum marriageable age for girls and 18 for boys, control by parents is usually limited to the ages of 16 to 18 and 18 to 21 for the two sexes respectively.[8] Some control by parents under these ages should serve a useful purpose. If, however, those above the minimum marriageable age actually marry, either against or without the consent of the parents, both Church and State consider the marriage valid. Ultimately the consent must come from the contracting parties themselves. The Church, it will be recalled, makes provision in her law for special cases in which the parents object to the marriage of minors, before sanctioning the marriage ceremony.

The applicants for licenses themselves should be obliged to produce available proofs of age. The baptismal certificate, de-

[8] Ibid., pp. 134–145.

manded by Church law, furnishes this. A transcript of birth certificate would perform the same service, and of recent years, births are being very generally recorded in this country. Passport records may also be obtainable in a number of cases. There are also a number of secondary means of evidence relating to age that may prove sufficient.

Richmond and Hall sum up the various considerations on early marriages as follows: "Further evidence on the biological side of this interesting subject of immaturity in mating is still necessary. In its social results today it concerns more than two-thirds of a million living Americans, and this estimate does not include the offspring. If our case studies are at all representative, one-half of these one-third of a million marriages had been celebrated with parental consent. The problem of pre-marital pregnancy, however, which is so often given as an argument for a very low marriageable minimum, enters into such immature ventures in only a small minority of instances. But a very important consideration is this, that even without parental consent, minors under sixteen, girl children, have little difficulty at present in obtaining sanction of the State to their marriage by the simple expedient of swearing falsely at license offices when asked their ages. Many of these children are too young to have any conception of the nature of an oath. Annulment proceedings, divorces, or separations without court sanction often follow as a matter of course. It is not necessary to wait for further scientific evidence before taking certain obvious measures to remedy this situation, for these measures have already been tested and been proved to be of genuine social value. They are, in a word, to raise by State legislative action the minimum marriageable age for girls to sixteen wherever it is now lower, with the power to grant exceptions in individual cases vested in certain designated judicial officers. Nor is it necessary, in most States at least, to wait for even this measure of advance before proceeding at once, by developing a new interest in what happens in license offices, there to demand better evidence of age and better evidence that parental consent has really been granted.''[9]

Clandestine Marriages.—The term clandestinity is taken here in the sense of ''self-marriage,'' or so-called common-law marriage, that is, marriage without an external form or rite on the part of either Church or State. Clandestine marriage of this sinister type is still recognized in twenty-four States of the Union and is on a parity with State-licensed and recorded marriage. As a consequence, if any administrative requirements are made too thoroughgoing to suit individuals they may evade them entirely by the simple expedient of contracting a marriage by consent only. If State marriage regulations are to become satisfactory it is altogether necessary that such common-law marriages be replaced by State-licensed marriages in all States. Not only do they make for the evasion of good laws, but, by reason of their secrecy and uncertainty, they do untold harm to thousands of individuals. There is beyond doubt great social value and significance in the outward form of marriage. It redounds to the good of both individual and society. The civil form represents the external consequences and responsibilities of the union while the religious sacrament suggests the illimitable significance of this relation in all its gravity for the whole inner man.

Evasive Out-of-State Marriages.—Elopements or other evasive forms of marriage have at least a tinge of secrecy or clandestinity about them. Such marriages are quite common to-day. It is admitted that in certain notorious marriage-market towns more licenses are issued and more marriages are performed for out-of-State applicants than for resident and out-of-town applicants of the same State combined. Occasionally there may be an out-of-State marriage based upon altogether justifiable grounds, just as there are defensible out-of-parish marriages at times. But the fact remains that many apply for licenses outside their own State for the sole purpose of evading certain provisions in marriage laws of their home

---

[9] Ibid., pp. 145–146.

States. Naturally, such a practice when common, goes far in nullifying the good effect that would otherwise result from the better marriage laws proper to some of the States.

Among possible remedies for this situation would be a legal residential requirement, similar to the six months legal residence required by the Church. For exceptional cases, namely, where there are really legitimate reasons for a marriage outside the State of residence of either candidate, the double license plan could be inaugurated. By this means license issuers could know whether candidates from other States were qualified by the laws of their own States to marry. This should go far in doing away with out-of-State marriages based on mere desire to escape from such provisions as parental consent, advance notice, medical certificate, minimum marriageable age, and such like requirements of home States. And such correction would mean much for the American family.

Near-Kin Marriage.—Near-kin marriages have universally been banned among both primitive and civilized peoples. We have noted how the Church forbade them and also gave attention to her reasons for doing so. Modern States have similar laws. In all States of the Union a man is forbidden by law to marry his mother, daughter, grandmother, granddaughter, sister, aunt, or niece. Women are likewise prohibited in all States from marrying within the corresponding degrees. Thirty of the States forbid marriage between first cousins. Oklahoma is the only State that extends this prohibition to second cousins. According to the *New Code* of Canon Law the Church has now limited her prohibition to the third degree. This recent change from the fourth to the third degree was undoubtedly brought about because in our modern mobile conditions near-relatives are more scattered than was formerly the case. Particularly are there vast differences in the mobility of the present day as compared with conditions under the manorial system and the stable parish of the Middle Ages. Under Church law, too, marriage is null and void between all ascendants and descendants.

Laws Peculiar to the State.—It is readily apparent from the foregoing considerations that most of the defenses that have been built up to protect marriage, and thereby the family and the home, are more or less common to both Church and State. Particularly are the two institutions in fundamental agreement on such matters as age, consent, publicity, and kinship. In detailed application, it is true, there are considerable differences both between Church and State and between the individual States. Certain laws, however, are altogether peculiar to the State, just as there are a few that belong within the special province of the Church. Mixed marriage laws are an example of the latter. Eugenic laws in vogue in some of the States, prohibiting the marriage of the feeble-minded, those with grave communicable diseases, or laws prohibiting marriage between whites and Negroes or Mongolians, are examples of the former. While the Church does not look upon these laws as invalidating the marriage, she nevertheless obeys them. Her ministers, for instance, would not officiate at such marriages.

There are, moreover, other laws of a social nature, that at least indirectly protect family life. Such are, for instance, various child labor laws, legal provision for family allowances, legislation for women in industry, mother's aid, and forms of legal insurance. These are given much attention in various sociological handbooks today. They represent activity on the part of the State that is beneficial to both individual and the home. It seems needless to repeat them here in detail.

Better marriage laws and various forms of social legislation may do much to better the present family situation. But in order that laws really become defenses of the family and safeguards of the home, it is necessary that they be efficiently administered and faithfully enforced. There is very much room for betterment here. As an example the reader need but recall the many "self-marriages" in the Chicago rooming district referred to above. Moreover, the State of Illinois is not one of the States that permits such common-law marriages.

Divorce Legislation.—The Church does not recognize divorce. It is banned alike by her teaching and her law. The bond of previous marriage is a diriment impediment to marriage, rendering an attempted marriage null and void. The States of the Union however, with the exception of South Carolina, do permit divorce and have laws regulating it. Like marriage laws, these divorce laws show great variation in the different States. The chaotic condition of this legislation tends to make the situation little less than ludicrous at times, and very generally harmful. The newer Western States have more liberal divorce laws than either Eastern or Southern States. Commonly, therefore, reformers in the West clamor for more restrictive legislation, while certain groups in the East and South urge a more liberal policy. Quite a few in all parts of the country advocate federal divorce laws, and others uniform State laws. In both cases the underlying motive is a more restrictive code of legislation.

As the present situation stands it is fairly easy for those who earnestly desire a divorce, to obtain one. Wrecking homes by obtaining divorces has become a lucrative job for many lawyers. Not a few cases of divorce are sheer collusion, the two simply agreeing that they wish a change and choosing a certain cause as a basis for the severing of the bond. "Of the total divorces granted in 1925, 84 per cent, or 146,000 cases were undefended. More often than not the participants have made some sort of agreement with each other." [10] Subterfuge, deceit, and even perjury are made use of by some to gain their point. By this time the wedge of divorce has been driven in very deeply in this country. Divorce has become a cultural trait with us, a part of our civilization, deeply embedded in the social organism. To eradicate it means a gigantic task, much as that faced by the infant Church in the days of Rome. Even to check it while causes for divorce are recognized, seems quite out of the question. The selfish drives fostered in the individual by means of it are too powerful. Yet the consistent annual increase is serious warning indeed that history may repeat itself. The issue of divorce is one of individual selfishness versus human welfare.

---

[10] Bromley, D. D., "Civilized Divorce," *Nation*, May 22, 1929; quoted from *Social Science Abstracts*, January 1930, p. 132.

Some New Legal Devices.—There seem to be some possibilities for good for the disorganized family in the domestic relations courts and divorce proctor systems introduced in a number of States in recent years. The domestic relations court diligently seeks out the real causes of family trouble and tries to prevent the dissolution of the home. The average orthodox court merely investigates the presence or absence of the particular cause that is brought forward by the parties as a basis for divorce. With a sufficient number of properly trained workers, the domestic relations court can find the fundamental causes of family disorganization; it can discover the possibilities of adjusting matters, and, above all, take pains to safeguard the rights and interests of helpless children who may be involved. The usual procedure is for the court workers to interview the complainants and try to work out a satisfactory adjustment outside the court. The court is used only in those cases in which no adjustment can be made without the force of the law. Even in the latter cases the information gathered by the workers is a help to the judge in making his decision.

The divorce proctor system is used in connection with the ordinary courts. An impartial person is delegated to investigate the case beforehand and to report the findings and make recommendations to the court at the hearing. In Kansas, for example, the county attorney is supposed to act as divorce proctor in each suit. The success of this system depends in no small degree upon the ability and zeal of the proctor. The suggestion of a guardian *ad litem* for children, advanced by some, seems deserving of consideration.

Legal Technique Alone Insufficient.—Both Church and State have a definite part to play in the protection of the rights of individuals and the public welfare by control over marriage. Yet too much must not be expected from legal technique alone. Even the most casual study of results of legislative efforts will convince one of the ineffectiveness of mere legal effort. The law, however, has its place and a betterment of marriage legislation should help the family situation. Good homes can no more be created directly by legislative acts than can good characters. But good laws can furnish external conditions and influences favorable to wholesome social life and erect many safeguards around marriage. They can help by postponing hasty marriages and even prevent such as are ill-advised.

A strong community sense or public opinion is a far more powerful influence. Law does not create nor, on the whole, control public opinion. Nor can laws operate effectively against an adverse public opinion. Such a community sense rises out of a philosophy of life and is developed through the various media of education and publicity. Education, therefore, is undoubtedly a more powerful factor in the promotion of family welfare than is law. Attention will be directed to some of the possibilities of this factor in the next chapter.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. Name the impediments to marriage.
2. What are the marriage and divorce laws of your State?
3. What social legislation in your State is beneficial to the family?
4. What success has attended European experiments with family allowances?
5. Show the evolution of the domestic relations court.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ayrinhac, H. A., *Marriage Legislation in the New Code.*
Bachofen, O. S. B., C. A., *A Commentary on Canon Law,* Vol. V.
"Dispensations, Matrimonial," "Banns of Marriage," "Marriage," "Nuptial Mass," "The Ritual of Marriage," "Clandestinity," *Catholic Encyclopedia.*
Cooper, J. M., *Religion Outlines for Colleges,* Course IV, Ch. 8.
Douglas, P. H., *Wages and the Family.*
Gemmil, W. N., "Domestic Relations." (*Blackstone Institute Lecture.*)

GOODSELL, W., *The Family as a Social and Educational Institution.*
GROVES, E. R., *Social Problems of the Family,* Ch. XV.
JOHNSEN, J. E., *Special Legislation for Women.*
MAY, G., *Marriage Laws and Decisions in the United States.*
PETROVITS, J. J., *The New Church Law on Matrimony.*
RICHMOND, M. E., "The Concern of the Community with Marriage," *The Family,* Dec., 1927.
RICHMOND, M. E. and HALL, F. S., *Marriage and the State.*
RYAN, J. A., *A Living Wage.*
U. S. Children's Bureau, "The Child, The Family, and The Court," Publication No. 193.

CHAPTER XVII

EDUCATION AND THE FAMILY

To-day few indeed would question that education is one of the most effective and far-reaching means for the re-integration of the modern family. Legislation, it is true, can do something. It can help conserve family life by preventing marriages that lack all elements of vitality and by providing conditions that are favorable to the growth and development of happy and contented home-life. But, over and above that, there is the far more fundamental task of fitting people generally, to establish wholesome homes. The individual must be prepared for marriage and for home-making and parenthood. To insure success in these vital matters it is, first of all, necessary that there be real and effective character training. Ideals must be instilled. Life must be dominated by principles. Such education should be the ultimate goal and inspiration of all training in the home, in the school, and in all other community educational agencies. Without the fundamental element of character training, education will not insure the sense of responsibility essential both to the family and to social life in general. In addition to such training, however, there is to-day much room for specific instruction for family life. Such instruction can be very beneficial. It is, in fact, to no small extent necessary.

Education for Family Life in the Past.—From time immemorial the home has been the greatest educative agency. Preparation for life generally was received in the family circle. There too, was given the informal education, and even formal instruction, that prepared youths to go out and found their own families. Through normal contacts within the confines of the little domestic world, the children gradually learned the lessons of life that prepared them for their roles in the great world outside. Through shared activities within the home they received many opportunities that quite informally and automatically prepared them for the task of founding a home and for rearing a family. From earliest years, for instance, the girls observed the mother as she carried on her various household tasks. Gradually they began helping in the sundry domestic duties under her direction and supervision. Thus step by step they became equipped with both the knowledge and the practice of home-making. And the training usually ranged all the way from the mere physical side of house-keeping to the religious and moral training of children. Even after marriage the children could still ordinarily seek the advice and generous aid of their elders. Thus through the ordinary routine of social experience the family was protected. In the times when parenthood was less difficult than it is today, there was little need for more formal education, or for specific instruction and guidance from extra-domestic sources as a preparation for family life. Domestic life was reasonably successful without it.

The Present Situation.—As pointed out in an earlier chapter, social conditions have changed radically during the last few decades. The Industrial Revolution was the fundamental factor in this change affecting the entire social organism and disturbing all its functions and processes. Among other unfortunate results is the fact that the more informal educative process of the homes of the past has largely broken down. The shared activities of work and play have more and more departed from the domestic hearth. With them have gone invaluable opportunities for child training within the domestic circle. All phases of this training have been affected—physical, mental, moral, and religious. And, while child care and guidance generally no longer can be carried on so informally and automatically in the modern home as in the closely integrated familial group of the past, so too, the training of children for the establishment of their own future home can not be carried out as effectively within the domestic circle as heretofore. Family life has become artificial and difficult. The whole socializing process, in fact, has become more involved and complex.

Looking to the Future.—The home must, of course, continue. There is no adequate substitute for it, and in the present social situation its functions are even more necessary than heretofore. But to work effectively it must be adapted in as far as possible to the new situation. This will involve such matters as bringing science more into the home, striving to raise family life to a higher level generally, and, in spite of all social transition, keeping unswervingly to principles and the true values of life. All this is largely a task of education.

Whether we like it or not, custom and tradition will no longer suffice for the efficient functioning of the home in the enriched culture of our many-faceted civilization of today. To allow the home to struggle on in the horse-and-buggy fashion of an agricultural age, while all other social institutions are adapted to a machinofacture age, is indeed to have little respect for "safety first" in matters that most vitally concern human welfare. In fact, if the home is permitted to lag behind and continue only in traditional ways, left on a mere spontaneous and impulsive basis, while other institutions have the advantage of science and are protected by special educational effort, it will inevitably slip behind in the march of progress. It will fail to function efficiently or to satisfy the home-makers themselves. And the results will speedily be reflected in the whole civilization of the time. We may take it as axiomatic that the higher a civilization, the greater must be its use of both science and art. In order that home-life may fit the particular culture of a time and function normally and satisfactorily, it must have the advantages of art and science proportionate to the civilization of the time. Otherwise it will remain at a lower level; it may even appear degrading and will fail to satisfy.

There is a need for a more scientific attitude towards family life today and for a greater use of science in the details of home-making and parenthood. Science is being used more and more in the ordinary details of daily life in our present super-civilization and many new kinds of work are being raised to professional levels. Science may well be brought into close contact with the home, and home-making thereby be raised to a professional or near-professional level. There are many different ways in which the home can make use of science today. Some knowledge of chemistry, bacteriology, and physiology can be very helpful to the modern home-maker in preparing food in well-balanced ration for the different members of the family. In fact, the modern mother might well be an expert dietitian. She would find ample use for her knowledge as mistress of a typical family of individuals of different ages and with varying needs and characteristics. Instruction in some of the elements of medical science could also prove most useful in helping the ordinary family group through the vicissitudes of physical health from infancy to adulthood. Instruction, too, in some of the essentials of mothercraft and even the professional training of a nurse could be used to very good advantage by the modern mother. And, again, training in child-psychology and child-study would undoubtedly prove invaluable in shaping the personality of children throughout the formative years of infancy and childhood and even on through adolescence and adulthood. The latter training, together with a knowledge of sociology, would be very helpful in socializing children—in fitting them for the various relationships of normal social life. And so one could go on multiplying the possibilities of science in the modern home. The amount of science the present-day home-maker in fact can apply in her work probably surpasses anything even dreamed of a generation or two ago.

The fine arts, too, may well be stressed much more than has been the case heretofore. They can furnish even more promising resources for the home-maker to draw upon than do the natural sciences. They may help greatly towards the culture of the child. And spiritual culture is no less important than physical nurture. It is, in fact, in the cultural and spiritual training of children that the greatest successes of the home-maker are achieved. The fine arts supply most valuable and promising material for such culture, for a refining process that will culminate in a high type of personality. Literature is one of the most useful branches of art used to this end. The mother can begin with bedtime stories in the child's earliest years, and then pass on to the rich field of juvenile literature and gradually lead it on to the reading habit under her direction. Properly used, literature can be a considerable help to the mother in the proper mental and spiritual development of her children. Music, too, deserves special mention as a resource for fostering both the spiritual unity of the family group and the cultural enrichment of its individual members. And besides refining personalities and binding the group in harmonious unison, music may furnish the home with many hours of pleasant enjoyment. Nor are the so-called domestic arts of minor importance. Knowledge of these as applied to textiles, clothing, house-furnishings, and decoration helps to create the atmosphere and tone that make the really cultured home and make the family hearth inviting and attractive to both child and adult. The house in which true domestic art is intelligently applied becomes a home that unfailingly shows the imprint of the presiding genius. Such homes, in turn, leave their mark upon the personalities of those who dwell in them. Real art of any kind may well be given a greater share of attention by modern home-makers, for all the fine arts may help to refine personalities by creating ideals, by strengthening good impulses and counteracting bad ones, and by serving as outlets for feelings that must otherwise remain bottled up and inhibited in civilized life. They all help to create harmony, in accordance with the principle of fellowship through common interests, and they enrich life generally.

By lifting home-life to higher levels through the application of art and science, home-making will be much more satisfying and the purposes of the family will be better realized than if the home is permitted to remain at lower levels and to lag behind the times and be hurt thereby. There is almost no limit to the intellectual, cultural, and spiritual resources of which the modern home-maker can profitably make use. Even the physical side of home-making can be made far less a drudgery to-day, and more attractive, through the application of science. Scientific methods of housekeeping have given much more leisure for cultural and spiritual interests, and for the cultural and spiritual training of children. And after all, that is the chief side of home-making. With a scientific attitude towards home-making in general and towards child care and training in particular, the modern home-maker's tasks can become intensely interesting and socially most valuable. With home-making raised to a professional or near-professional level, by the application of science and art, the task of the modern mother will become incomparably greater and more satisfying than that of the out-of-the-home worker. In fact, there is scarcely a profession or career that can lead into such a variety of cultural fields, and offer larger opportunities for self-realization on the part of the individuals concerned, especially when the solid satisfactions of successful and permanent achievement are taken into consideration. But to leave home-making on a low cultural level while the rest of society marches progressively onward would, by sheer contrast tend to make home-life unsatisfying. It might seem like undignified drudgery and it may prevent the enjoyment of a contented life.

Particularly is it essential to-day that the social sciences keep better step with the physical sciences. Moreover, to become really beneficial to home and family life, the findings of science must somehow be placed within the reach of those who are home-makers or shall become so.

THE SCHOOL

With the home stripped of many of its former functions, and weakened particularly as an education agency, it must look increasingly to outside agencies for help. With the growing complexity of our civilization the school has been called upon more and more to prepare the individual for the major experiences of life. It should be able also to render some assistance in preparing individuals for the serious tasks of home-making and parenthood. It would, of course, be idle to think that school instruction can become a panacea for all family ills. But it should by no means be foolhardy to expect it to help considerably toward preparing individuals for an auspicious start on the road to domestic happiness and success. Indirectly, it is true, the school has been of some supplementary help to the home. But more recently there has been a growing conviction that it should more directly prepare for family life. This conviction has been expressed in various ways; first of all, in so-called domestic science or home economics courses.

Domestic Science Courses.—These courses have had a place in a number of secondary schools for several decades past. At first, the courses represented rather blind and experimental efforts to prepare girls for certain household duties. In content they embraced instruction concerning foods, textiles, home decoration; and in course of time, bits of information regarding mothercraft and parenthood were in some cases added. More recently there has been a broadening of content and more of a scientific attitude with regard to these courses. With this they have been raised to a higher level and considered of more educational value than was formerly the case. There is still room for improvement if really worthwhile contributions to family life are to be expected from these courses. They must more nearly become an actual preparation for home-making and family life. Not only household duties but also the problems of human relationships in marriage and the family must receive attention. They must become social as well as occupational. And they must, in many instances at least, become more scientific in character.

Sociology Courses on the Family.—The recent growth of the social sciences in the schools holds out considerable promise of hope for the future. Sociology has already given some attention to the fundamental social unit, the family. Quite commonly, in fact, university departments of sociology now offer one or more courses in marriage and the family. In their beginnings such courses were largely historical. Then, again, they were anthropological; that is, a study of the family life of primitive peoples. More recently attention has been given the modern disorganized family. Some beginnings also have been made in the study of the normal family of the day. Some research work of real merit on this subject has been carried on by the sociology departments of schools, such as Chicago University and North Carolina University. Much may be expected from these efforts as they take on greater proportions. A course on the family might very well be given a place in any college and should extend to home-making, in the sense of household duties, and to parenthood, in the sense of child care and training.

Students are eager for such courses. Of a number of different sociology courses the writer has taught in a college within the past ten years, none has ever aroused the interest that his course on marriage and the family has, and he feels satisfied that this particular course has accomplished by far more practical good. Not a few of the students have repeatedly given sincerest expression to their conviction that such a course was invaluable and a very real need to-day for any college man or woman.

There is still much room for growth here. In reality the whole idea of scientific study of the family is in its infancy. There is need in our schools for more social science courses generally. And there is particular need for such as relate to family life. Courses in civics, for instance, have become quite common. Community problems courses have grown in number. Yet the home is certainly not less important than either community or State. There is need for much more attention to marriage and the family on the part of the school system.

Some have suggested special college departments, some even special schools, for the training of professional home-makers. A few such home-makers in a community might do much to raise the general level of the homes of the group. The idea should not be an idle dream since there is really no limit to the higher knowledge that can be used in this important profession. Moreover, it has become quite characteristic of our civilization for all big and worth-while ideas to work themselves out through a special school system. Meanwhile very special attention should be given the matter in social service schools. Further research for scientific facts, suitable textbooks, and able instructors are some very real needs of the present in this field.

Private Schools.—It is perhaps in the private girls' schools that at present most can be expected by way of preparation for home-making. Few indeed could be found who would advocate a total differentiation of curriculum in the schools for the different sexes, for after all, our general culture is the same for men and women alike. Yet some differentiation seems entirely proper. To pass up training in mother-craft and home-making generally and to crowd the curriculum with courses in ancient languages, mathematics, and the physical sciences, would be to let slip some excellent opportunities for preparing girls for important tasks that the vast majority will not only meet with in life but that will constitute a great part of their life's activity. It is true many of the branches taught in these schools could be much more home-centered and child-centered than they really are, without greatly disturbing the present curriculum. Many graduates have declared themselves unsatisfied with their school experience as far as preparation for home-making is concerned. Moreover, differentiation in these schools is easily possible. There has been some awakening of late, but there is still vast room for more on this score. The arts, some of which are fairly common in these schools, may well be stressed still more. In the case of the natural sciences taught, their bearing upon home-life may be more consistently and definitely pointed out. There is, moreover, need in these schools for more social science, and particularly, for sociological courses that relate more immediately to marriage and the family.

In the case of Catholic academies and colleges for women, perhaps a very valuable addition to the average staff would be an elderly or middle-aged matron who has reared her family and is still seeking opportunity to make herself useful to mankind. There are undoubtedly many such with the necessary leisure time and rich intellectual resources, with mellowed sympathies and an abundance of experience direct from the school of life, who could do unlimited good in some such capacity as dean of women or as confidential adviser to the students. Such would not only instruct and advise by word, but their example would undoubtedly be far-reaching. Many of them are of the most wonderful beings on earth, tried in the fire of maternal sacrifice, sensibly wise through actual experience of living, deeply religious themselves, and convinced of the need of this supreme element of religion in life. They might well serve as examples of the highest type to the American school girl.

While home-making may well be stressed more in the training of the girl than in that of the boy, education for parenthood in the case of both is altogether in place. In fact, it is a very real need to-day.

Private schools generally can undoubtedly do more by way of preparation for family life than can the public schools. Very commonly they possess a more home-like atmosphere. There is, moreover, a closer contact between these schools and the parents of the pupils and consequently more coöperation between home and school, and a more sympathetic understanding of the tasks of each other. They can go far in developing the human values of a homelike environment and the atmosphere of human relationship that is such an important socializing factor in home training itself. Then, too, the private schools are not dependent upon the public purse. Hence they have greater liberty for educational experiment and for readaptation to apparent needs that arise. More recently parent-teacher associations have done something to bring the average home and the school into closer contact.

The Nursery School.—As far as actual child guidance is concerned, perhaps the nursery school has done more, directly and in a more truly scientific way, than any other type of school. It has, moreover, done much by way of actual training for parenthood. It is a recent development and has apparently been planted in good soil, for its growth has been fairly rapid and its fruit quite satisfactory. In this country the main aim of the nursery school seemingly is to help parents in their tasks of child training; that is, in understanding and directing their children, and to create for the child an environment that offers it the best possible opportunity for wholesome development. In theory at least, it does not seek to supplant the mother in the home but rather to give her expert assistance and guidance, to ground the modern home, as an educational institution, on a scientific basis. It assumes that many mothers have difficulties with their children of preschool age and need special assistance to solve their problems. It assumes that the average parent has not the scientific training that would equip him to function most effectively in the physical, mental, and social aspects of child guidance in our present complex culture. The nursery school seeks to furnish the necessary aid and instruction. And it does that not only for cases of ''problem children'' but also for the delicate task of character building in the normal child during the early formative years.

It is unfortunate that so far the number of nursery schools has been quite limited. Because of their costliness only the higher classes have been able to enjoy their advantages. Perhaps the under-privileged could readily be given these advantages by developing day nurseries into nursery schools or their equivalent. There seems little reason why the day nursery cannot perform many of the same services for children of working mothers that the nursery school does for the other group. As a matter of fact, such an educational mission seems to be dawning upon some of these schools. A number of them no longer consider their tasks limited to providing food or shelter for the children under their care; more careful and intelligent attention is being given to play, diet, and health, and the possibilities of kindergarten classes are being recognized. Yet according to recent figures, Catholic day nurseries reach only 23,000 children. This can be only a fractional part of the children of the 2,000,000 married women gainfully employed in the United States to-day. At that, however, such institutions can be of great value, helping to raise the general level of child care by showing the possibilities of the application of science to the many phases of child guidance.

Some day nurseries are even becoming community centers with study clubs for mothers and classes for older children. This opens up greater opportunities for important contributions to family life. Study clubs have also been started under expert guidance in connection with some of the nursery schools.

THE CHURCH

Among the different institutions or agencies that can help the family by way of instruction and guidance, certainly the Church ranks high. She has both the opportunity to give direction in graded and guarded ways and has leaders equipped for the task.

The Church's Opportunities for Instruction.—The mission of the Church is to teach. She gets into fairly constant contact with her people in order that they may be taught. Thus the Church through her school teaches children the essentials of marriage and of the family in special religion classes. She reaches both child and adult in her ordinary and extraordinary religious services. Missions and retreats offer particular opportunities for instruction in this field, as well as for inspiration and encouragement to duty in family life. Then, too, the various groupings found in the average parish are a special advantage. Thus there are organizations for married men and for married women. There are sodalities or societies for young men and for young women. Frequently there are even special organizations for the children of school age. The regular meetings and other gatherings held by these parish groups furnish many opportunities for instruction according to the particular needs of the group. More valuable still is the Church's opportunity for the personal interview or for individual guidance or counsel. At times this takes place in the confessional, since the matter is frequently allied to some question of duty or responsibility, or to the observance of some point of the moral law. The average pastor, too, is frequently sought out by parents for particular guidance in difficulties arising in home-life. The Church, therefore, has a host of opportunities for reaching the faithful, and to offer them guidance in accord with the Christian principles of marriage and with the social relations of members within the family circle. The most effective work, of course, is done by individual treatment. There direct attention can be given to particular problems that may have arisen in the particular household. The guidance can be based upon the concrete peculiarities of the individual in the case. The more general group instruction is of considerable value too, but is limited to some extent by the fact that it can be based only upon the general knowledge of human nature rather than upon the particular characteristics of a special case. In either case the matter is kept closely related to religion, is clothed, as it were, with the garb of religion—a matter of no small import.

The Priest's Training.—Not only has the Church a ready-made organization offering varied channels or opportunities for instruction, but she has also leaders fitted for the work. The older priests are not only equipped with special training and long years of study but also with invaluable experience through intimate contact with human nature. Though they themselves have never reared a family, they have had the normal contacts of family life in childhood and adolescence. In their own domestic circles of childhood they observed the manner in which family life is conducted. Then again, the average priest, because of his official duties, has considerable contact with many families other than that in which he was reared. Priests also have opportunity to derive helpful information and advantage from the principles of ascetical, moral, and pastoral theology they pursue in the seminary. Furthermore, they usually have considerable experience with school children. This gives them a fund of knowledge and experience that is helpful in child guidance. Again, priests receive the confidences of many people regarding their domestic difficulties. Hence they come to know the status of many families and not merely of one. Thus they acquire a broad view and a wide experience that should qualify them in a high degree to give family counsel. Certainly the average young man and woman who begin the rearing of a family have but a small fraction of the knowledge of marriage and the family accumulated by the priest of many years' service in the cause of religion.

The young priest coming from the seminary to-day will be in quite a different world from that for which his older brother in the priesthood was prepared. If he is to be as helpful in the guidance of the family as the latter was, the seminarian of to-day must have more definite preparation than was given in the past. More than ever must his studies of canon law, of pastoral, ascetical, and moral theology, help to show him the practical social aspects of these branches. Particularly would a thorough course in pastoral theology that includes domestic affairs and is fully suited to the times prove invaluable to the young levite.

Over and above this, there is place for an efficient social expert in the parish, for a well-trained social-worker, fitted to advise intelligently with regard to budgeting, housekeeping, child-care and home-making generally. Such an individual should be able to do much to raise the level of family life in a parish, to make the home more efficient and successful, and thereby to make the task of home-making both interesting and a source of great satisfaction and self-realization.

The Church gives very special attention to the preparation of those who enter religious life. Her efforts are very well repaid. In the present situation of the family she would undoubtedly be amply repaid for any efforts centered in due preparation for marriage and for an intelligent and satisfying family life.

PARENT-EDUCATION

Since parenthood is becoming ever more difficult, there is a constantly growing need for specific instruction in the task of training children in the home. For this, however, the present generation of parents can expect little, if any, help from such a medium of instruction as the schools. Moreover, many children of the present generation will never get into the higher reaches of the school system where such special instruction may be given. Hence the need for some other means to meet the situation. One method that has been tried and holds forth considerable promise is parent-education. This particular venture in education as a help to the family consists in an effort to give present-day parents the advantages of scientific instruction in child care and training, quite aside from the regular channels of school instruction. It recognizes the fact that the parents are nearest the child and consequently exercise the greatest influence over it during its early, formative years. This trend is further based upon the notion that the better understanding the parents have of the processes by which personalities are fashioned through various conditioning influences of the environment, the better will they be able to train the child. Since efforts in the field of child research have met with considerable success, it was urged that parents in general be given the advantage of these scientific findings. The result was the movement for parent education.

The movement itself is proving to be of real benefit. The family is in difficulties and needs help in our changing and complex civilization. It is better to help parents perform their tasks than to advocate substitutes for them. The parent-education movement is really a recognition of the fact that there is no satisfactory substitute for the parent. It is, furthermore, a recognition of the need of science in our present super-civilized home to keep it functioning normally and at a proper level.

Development of the Movement.—To some extent, at least, the idea of parent-education grew out of the public health movement that has been under way the past twenty-five years or so. Attention was first of all directed only towards the physical care of children. With the growing realization on the part of social workers that one of the most important factors in a large percentage of poverty cases was sickness, social work began to center special attention upon health. It soon became evident that, in order to prevent much ill-health, the child had to be reached in its earliest years. Increased efforts to instruct mothers in the fundamentals of the physical care of children was the result.

Close upon the heels of the public health movement came the mental hygiene movement. With the growth of the psychological sciences in the schools and the dissemination of scientific findings in this field through the efforts of the Committee for Mental Hygiene and other channels, the close relations between the physical welfare of the child and its mental side were noted by social-workers and consequently the mental was stressed in their case work. Here again the mother in the home was recognized as an all-important factor because of her early intimate contacts with the child in the home.

Since both the physical and the mental have a part in the socialization of the individual, it was but inevitable that attention to the physical and the psychical should eventually be extended to the child's social development. Various studies showed that cases both of ideal socialization and of maladaptation hark back in great part to the child's earliest years under parental tutelage in the home. They showed that the early conditionings of the primary impulses of the child in the home environment lead to responses that may bode either good or ill for the individual and society. It was recognized that ignorance of these early conditioning influences, rather than parental neglect, accounted for many of the failures in families in socializing their children. Hence it was felt that the best and speediest results would come from parent-education, from bringing the findings of science in the field of child-guidance to the attention of parents. This has been done very considerably, especially through mothers' study clubs and through a special literature on child-care and training that has sprung up recently, setting forth the findings of clinics, children's foundations, child research departments of universities, and such like. Placed within the reach of parents such studies can be very helpful to them in their tasks of rearing children. It can undoubtedly, however, accomplish more good if there is expert instruction and guidance of some kind in addition, for instance, through study clubs competently led.

While something has already been accomplished by the parent-education movement, still untold opportunity remains for improvement and for further progress. The so-called Century of the Child is still very young and the results of child-research and the application of these findings before the next century mark draws near may be considerably beyond the reach of the imagination of to-day. It is very essential, however, that the movement be kept upon a sound scientific basis. Untold damage could be done here by the quack and near-expert. Real experts are needed for research and for proper dissemination of the new knowledge. They are essential for the success of the movement.

SEX EDUCATION

The instinct of sex is a matter of vital concern to the family. In a chapter on education and the family a few words regarding sex education should undoubtedly find a place. The subject is given considerable attention to-day, in some instances, too much so. In the transitional period through which we are passing, sex has thrust itself upon our attention, and at times, in a rather brazen fashion. Thoughtful and conscientious leaders are gravely concerned as to how to deal with the new situation. Sex education has been stressed considerably as a possible remedy. Much, of course, would depend upon the kind of instruction and upon the manner in which it is given. As far as Catholic theologians are concerned, it is pretty well agreed among them that some graded and guarded instruction should be given and that the major responsibility for this rests with the parents. Something further may be added through the various channels of instruction open to school and Church.

The Part of Parents.[1]—The ideal situation would be the one in which the parents gave all the necessary instruction. The first opportunity for this presents itself in the earliest years of the child's life. About the sixth or seventh year the child usually becomes curious about the origin of life and begins to question his parents. This is an opportunity for the mother, who has the child's utmost confidence at the time, to impress upon its mind the sacredness of life and of motherhood. That is done by telling the child how in Nature's plan the mother is called upon to sacrifice for the infant child. Not only will such information properly imparted give the child a sense of the sacredness of life and motherhood, but it will also satisfy its curiosity and increase the bond of affection and confidence between mother and child. The latter result will serve the worth-while purpose of teaching the child to go to the parent for information when further questions arise. But if the parent fails to answer the child's question, the latter's curiosity will only be heightened; it will be inclined to look elsewhere for information and have its confidence in its parents weakened. The sum total result would likely be harmful information from untrustworthy sources and a faulty attitude towards sex. Instead of learning in early years to consider it an object of intelligent reverence and the source of some of the finest and most sacred things of life, the child will rather tend to associate sex with the filthy and indecent. Both half knowledge and incorrect information may readily do harm. Here, as well as at later stages, the instruction should be matter-of-fact, though always tempered with a sense of the sacred.

---

[1] Cooper, J. M., "Sex Education in the Home," *Catholic Charities Review*, Sept. and Dec. 1921; Hall, W. S., "The Adolescent Period" in M. V. O'Shea's, *The Child: His Nature and His Needs*, pp. 300–325.

As adolescence approaches, the question of fatherhood arises. The ideal situation would be for the father to give suitable instruction to the adolescent boy and the mother to the girl. The father can point out to the adolescent boy, how Nature at this period prepares a special substance that is carried by the blood to all active tissues of the body and causes the growth of those qualities that are peculiar to virile manhood. Elaborate sex information is not required, but the meaning of fatherhood as Nature's plan for the propagation of the human race should be briefly explained. The function of fatherhood may be likened to a communicated power of God, a power that is of the nature of a sacred trust, a thing to be carefully guarded and never wasted. Perhaps the best medium of instruction here is plant life. Stimulating charts and illustrations are both harmful and unnecessary. In like manner the mother can explain to the daughter how Nature, at the period of adolescence prepares a substance that will eventually develop within her the characteristics of ideal womanhood. The girl can readily be impressed with the fact that her person is sacred to future womanhood and motherhood.

As inter-sex attraction develops, the purposes and functions of the courtesies and conventions in the field of sex should be briefly explained. An attitude of chivalry should be a particular aim in the case of the boy and due reserve and modesty in that of the girl. Such attitudes, reverently instilled, will go far in keeping them above reproach in their thought-life and habits. Then, too, it is worthy of note that there are many diffused outlets, many sublimations for sex at this age, and the wise parent will endeavor as far as possible to make provision for such in the home circle.

Brief information regarding the moral hazards of pick-up acquaintances, particularly also of amusement places and the nature and communicability of the social diseases, could also properly be given by the parent. And finally, before marriage, particularly the daughter should be told in what the marriage relation consists. The mother, trusted confidante and adviser, is again the best source of information.

The School and Sex Education.—Some parents, as a matter of fact, shirk their duty with regard to sex instruction or they are unable to perform it. A campaign of education of fathers and mothers would seem to be the logical step to remedy the matter. The spectacular character of sex is only exaggerated the more by parading sex information publicly, by imparting it to groups or crowds outside the home. Consequently, the school, for instance, cannot become a satisfactory substitute for the home in this field. There is lacking the confidential relation of parent and child present in the home circle. Furthermore, the school does not get the child early enough and very generally the teachers are not equipped to give the necessary instruction. It is true that, incidentally and informally, something can be done in connection with courses in nature study or biology. Far more, however, can be done by stimulating the will than by direct instruction in the school. The highest merit of the school in the field of sex lies in its power of character-training. All self-control is conducive to self-mastery in the sphere of sex. The practices of self-denial even in innocent and indifferent things enable the individual to deny himself the more easily in matters that are illicit. "Habits of self-mastery, courage, control, and their accompanying sense of spiritual freedom and achievement, acquired in non-sex matters, may not automatically spread to the sex field, but the transfer will be distinctly facilitated under intelligent moral coaching that will bring to conscious recognition the identical elements in both sex and non-sex ideals."[2] Without such training in will-power, however, information may easily prove dangerous and harmful. But with earnest character-training and with the ethical motive constantly inculcated in life, when the critical years of adolescence dawn, only a brief reference to this new test of virtue and manhood is necessary. To unload upon the modern school, which is largely non-religious and quite inadequate in its character-training, a quantity of information regarding one of the most powerful drives in human nature, is indeed to play with fire. And the conflagration is one that is not easily stopped when it gets a foothold in a society. The school should, however, be able to do much to develop chivalry, to develop the newly emerging powers of self-sacrifice and capacities for self-control in the adolescent and in various ways to draw out the budding altruistic tendencies in the individual, and to supply suitable outlets for sublimating sex. "The very same process which carries with it the greatest dangers which beset the path of youth, contains within itself the seeds of the most powerful safeguards against these very dangers. *The wisest educator is he who makes the best use of this fact.* His task is not, however, a simple one. The ethical stimulus will require to be continually deepened and strengthened by religious appeal. The forces which Nature arouses for the propagation of the race are not so easily held in check.

---

[2] Cooper, J. M., *op. cit.*, p. 324.

The higher tendencies toward chivalry and self-denial become really dominant over the merely natural impulses only when they are purified and strengthened by their being brought into relationship with the conception of God, when the world of mere sexuality with its gross and sensual forgetfulness is surpassed by the perfect surrender of self to a higher life.''[3]

The whole subject of sex education is primarily one of religious and moral education, of character-building. It is best given in an atmosphere of religion. It should be based upon an unswerving moral code that looks to the common good or human welfare rather than to the whims and caprices of individual passion. Hence the Church can do much in this field. She can easily reach the individual and also the groups according to age and sex. Moreover, she has trained moralists who have placed themselves entirely above the field of sex and who consequently render judgment in these matters in an unbiased and unprejudiced way. And her doctrines are based not only on the sacredness of the human body because of fatherhood and motherhood, but upon the fact that bodies are ''temples of the Holy Ghost,'' tabernacles for the Holy Eucharist, which are destined to arise in a glorified state in the resurrection.

With proper sex education there should arise a generation that realizes the values of spiritual love and the dangers of mere physical sex; that realizes that to trifle with the counterfeits of love is to make impossible the full enjoyment of genuine affection and that to fritter away love's capacities on such a cheap emotional level, for instance, as petting, is to give up hope of ever knowing the richness and compelling power of love at its best. Such a generation should grasp the truth that to forego an immediate, limited satisfaction for the sake of reaching a fuller, more lasting one on a higher plane of life is essential to human progress, and that it is to ascend higher in the scale of civilization. And on the other hand, it should realize that to seek immediate satisfaction and thrills is to suffer a progressive limitation to carry life to higher altitudes, and that it is to descend to a lower scale of civilization. When these truths are realized and acted upon, family life will be abundantly the gainer.

---

[3] Foerster, F. W., *Marriage and the Sex Problem*, pp. 200–201.

SUPPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. Does co-education hinder or promote good family life?
2. Is parent-education practical?
3. How can parent-teacher associations benefit the home?
4. What topics would you include in a college program for parenthood instruction?
5. How might the interests of the family be popularized?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cooper, J. M., "Sex Education in the Home," Reprint from Proceedings of National Conference of Catholic Charities, 1921.
Foerster, F. W., *Marriage and the Sex Problem,* Part II.
Gans, B. S., *Concerning Parents.*
Gerrard, T. J., *Marriage and Parenthood,* Ch. XI.
Groves, E. R. and Ogburn, W. F., *American Marriage and Family Relationships,* Ch. VIII.
National Society for the Study of Education, Year Book, XXVIII, Vol. XIV.
Popenoe, P., *The Conservation of the Family,* Part III.
Reeve, M. W., "Training for Parenthood," *Journal of Social Hygiene,* Vol. X, No. 3.
Richards, F. H., "Training for Parenthood," *Journal of Social Hygiene,* Vol. XII.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE CHURCH AND FAMILY RE-INTEGRATION

To-day, as in the past, the Church contributes much towards the upbuilding of a wholesome family life and towards the promotion of satisfactory and harmonious relations within the home circle. Thus the Church by her teaching still points out the essentials of lasting marriage; she prepares the individual for the burdens of family life by developing in him a sense of responsibility and self-control; she strengthens by her ministrations of grace and urges him on through motives of love and of fear; she compels by her precepts and protects by her laws. By theory and practice, by doctrinal tenets, both in faith and in morals, in fact by her entire system, the Church helps bolster up the family. Any serious effort to analyze the whole system of the Church as it relates to the family would take us too far afield here, but brief attention can be given to a few of the influences she brings to bear more immediately upon marriage and the family.

In using the term *Church* in this connection, the writer has in mind the Catholic Church. He can claim greater familiarity with both her doctrine and her practice than with that of any other body of believers. Moreover, the members of this group represent the integrated Christianity of the past, that very force which constructed upon the broken familial remains of paganism the strong family life of the Middle Ages. This remarkable accomplishment, together with her two thousand years of experience and her contact with peoples of every grade of civilization, from the highest to the lowest, all demand respectful attention, and that even quite aside from any special prerogative to which the Church may lay claim. In fact, her undoubted stabilizing influence over the family life of her own members to-day in the face of all social and familial disturbance must elicit the attention of those who value the family and who are concerned about its reconstruction.

THE ESSENTIALS OF MARRIAGE

First and foremost, the Church in the face of all the opposition of the *Zeitgeist* nevertheless stands for the three essential foundation stones of marriage, indissolubility, unity, and sanctity, without which the superstructure of family life cannot stand. Because of the loss of these, the renowned nations of the past have become extinct. One can readily agree with Ross L. Finney, who concludes, after referring to the various perversions of the family life of the past, that "practically every conceivable type of unnatural family life, and every form of perverted relation between men and women has been tried out to a demonstration of its results. If there is anything that racial experience may be said to have settled it is that the permanent, monogamous family is the only type upon which the welfare of a people can be based, all other forms having proved unnatural and destructive. Racial experience confirms the teaching of religion that marriage should be regarded as a sacred relation."[1]

No Compromise with Divorce.—Of particular social value is the Church's adamant stand against divorce, the modern pastime which is rending society asunder. The difference between the attitude of the Church on divorce and that obtaining in many modern countries is, in its final analysis, merely the difference between social-welfare and individual selfishness. The divorce principle is contrary to both natural and divine law. Consequently the Church will never yield. And, ultimately, that very unswerving stand is to the advantage as well of the individual as of society constituted by the family group.

---

[1] Finney, R. L., *Elementary Sociology.*

The child, primarily, is the innocent victim of divorce. Divorce leaves the child defenseless and robbed of its right to the maximum and permanent care of both parents. The mother, too, is deprived of the support, protection and affectionate care due to her from the father. Moreover, divorce enables the father, and at times even the mother, to evade the voluntarily assumed parental responsibilities. To-day, furthermore, many divorces are due to the fact that parental impulses were never exercised. The purposes of marriage were entirely set aside and the normal accomplishments of lasting marriage left altogether unrealized.

Nor will dissoluble marriage have a social value equal to that of the permanent union. The family will never become the school of self-discipline and self-sacrifice it should be as long as we make it possible for men and women to escape the obligations of married life. And without self-discipline and self-sacrifice in family life as the source of society, we dare not expect it in the larger social group. The home is essentially the cradle of the social virtues. Let difficulties justify the breaking of the marriage contract, and the respect in which marriage should be held will be undermined and the selfish and the self-centered will have the opportunity of evading their obligations, and serious temptations will be placed in the way of those who have been bearing their difficulties in the proper spirit.

The Wedge Principle and Divorce.—The history of divorce legislation shows that the possibility of securing divorce under any pretext whatsoever leads to the securing of divorce under even the slightest pretext. Allow divorce (with the privilege of remarriage) in one case and the flood gates are opened. Admit the divorce principle and the wedge-like operation will rend asunder society as well as the home Divorce statistics in our own country prove this contention. And the same can be said of other countries in which divorce is not reserved to the èlite few. The motives of those seeking relief from matrimonial ties are too subjective to allow such distinctions as unaided reason can make in the case of other matters. Many, it is known, have deliberately committed adultery, where that was the only basis for divorce, in order to obtain a divorce. But more usually one cause leads to other causes, and this situation in turn to hasty and ill-advised marriages. When the parties know they can break the marriage bonds readily and marry another mate, they exercise less foresight than they would if they knew the step was for life. With divorce tolerated, it can only be expected that many will rush heedlessly into matrimony without due regard for its sacred obligations and responsibilities. And these hasty marriages that result will in turn lead to a greater increase of divorce. The only remedy for the situation lies in the return to the rule that once obtained in Christendom and still obtains in the Church—the rule enunciated by the Creator and Ruler of the universe, ''What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.'' Common sense and Christian teaching alike demand that the marriage bond be permanent. The drift of the times, it is true, is against it. But that is of no consequence if the drift is wrong. Human welfare demands that it be directed aright.

A Greater Versus a Lesser Evil.—It is objected that at times innocent victims are made to suffer because of an unyielding attitude on divorce. It is true beyond doubt that in exceptional cases an individual wife or husband may suffer as an altogether innocent victim. And like all innocent unfortunates, such deserve every sympathy. But better by far is it that an occasional individual suffer than that great numbers of innocent mates and helpless children should suffer, that the very structure of society itself should be rent asunder, and that the nation should die. No matter how we theorize about the matter, the fact of everyday experience shows that the powerful drives of selfishness in human nature are such that, the wedge once inserted into the opening made by one cause for divorce, they will not cease their driving force till untold misery has resulted to individuals and irreparable harm has been done to society.

For certain grave reasons the Church recognizes a temporary or permanent separation of mates, but denies the right of remarriage during the life time of the separated mate. She uncompromisingly upholds the Christian teaching that man and wife are one "until death do them part." This attitude does not appeal to the selfish side of man, but it does promote, to the highest degree, the rights and welfare of the defenseless child and the mother and thus safeguards the home and society.

THE DISCIPLINE OF THE CHURCH

The discipline of life which the Church constantly inculcates is another means by which she to-day, as in the past, maintains family unity. This particularly, is of the utmost value to-day when a soft creed that shrinks from responsibility and a selfish individualism that constantly defeats human welfare, has greatly weakened the moral fibre of the entire social fabric. Though the Church is somewhat at odds with the modern world because she refuses to drift with the spirit of the times, her discipline of life is in reality a far-reaching influence for the good of society and a positive need for the reëstablishment of the modern family.

The Need for Discipline.—The Church insists that life must be directed or, in other words, disciplined. Although the idea carries with it little appeal to a people given considerably to ease and pleasure, the truth of the matter is that our civilization is rapidly becoming sick at heart for want of it as was much of society in the infant days of the Church. The family is in a particularly crying need of such discipline. Social-workers who deal with the modern family frankly admit that the disintegrated home is very largely a reflection of the moral failure of parents to sacrifice self and their own pleasures in the interest of the family group. Thus, as a rule, the fundamental factor in desertion and non-support cases, is simply unwillingness to meet the difficulties and trials of married life. The father or mother, or both, simply refuse to shoulder their burdens. They reject the responsibilities they deliberately assumed. As a result family life suffers, the home functions like a broken instrument, and at times even fails, leaving its purposes totally unrealized. A sense of responsibility that is the fruit of self-discipline, and that goes hand in hand with a well-developed moral character, is the indispensable remedy for such a situation. And the Church ever stands for such a sense of responsibility and for such self-discipline.

Like all other social institutions, the family is a discipline of human nature rather than a concession to it. Self-denial is of the very essence of home-life. Here continuous sacrifice is demanded. Without constant compromises and surrenders on the part of husband and wife in their mutual relations, peace and harmony in the home is an impossibility. Without repeated denial of self on the part of all members of the family, obligations remain unfulfilled, clashes multiply, the group becomes disorganized, its aims remain unrealized, and its purposes unfulfilled.

Only the disciplined individual can bring himeslf regularly to make the sacrifices family life requires. Mere information can not be a substitute for that discipline. Knowledge of duties and the manner of fulfilling them will avail little standing alone. A positive need for the modern family is a healthier attitude towards self-denial and self-sacrifice on the part of the individuals who establish the home. Without these necessary elements, efforts to reconstruct the domestic world will largely prove futile.

But such self-discipline is not given with the marriage tie. The family, it is true, is a great school for the development of self-mastery and a sense of responsibility. But a newly established family must not be allowed to begin at zero and then be expected to fulfil its purpose. The discipline needed for the establishment of a wholesome family must begin in the individual's earliest years. If asocial propensities are to be weeded out, and social tendencies to be made to grow and wax strong, the unformed child must be the object, early in life, of zealous and experienced care and solicitude. The idea of self-restraint, as the law of life, must find a lodging in his mind in his youngest years. A tempered and rational discipline must be brought to influence his training. Above all must self-discipline be inculcated.

The Church and the Discipline of Life.—To inculcate such discipline is peculiarly, though not exclusively, within the province of the Church. And the Church ever consistently stands for discipline as the law of life. She sees the need for it and grasps its full intent. Aside from any special prerogative to which the Church lays claim, there is the fact of her many years of experience with all classes of peoples that has made her a wise guide indeed. She realizes that satisfying social life is impossible without self-denial, self-control, self-conquest, and self-mastery on the part of the individual. She realizes that nothing is of greater value to family life than a deep sense of responsibility in those who compose the group. She knows, too, that only the discipline flowing from a well-rounded religious training will make reasonably certain in the masses a proper attitude towards family responsibilities. Hence the Church brings to bear upon the individual the whole force of her influence as a means to develop these qualities of self-control and self-discipline. Even from earliest days of childhood the spirit of religion begins its whispered admonitions, constantly driving home the lesson of self-mastery as the secret of personal and social well-being. The very sense of reverence that inevitably goes hand in hand with a deeply religious spirit, is one of the fundamental bases of moral character.

The Church in various ways compels the individual to observe this law of life. The moral law she inculcates, the ideals she sets before her members, the principles of asceticism she upholds, the compensations she offers, the graces she administers, the compulsions of love and of fear she makes use of, the motive of the supernatural that runs through all her teaching in class-room and pulpit—all coöperate to inculcate respect for this law of life. And in many ways this discipline redounds to the good of family life. Although discipline in non-marital matters may not automatically spread to marital ones, nevertheless, under intelligent moral guidance, such transfer can be readily brought about. Moreover, such discipline makes for character and for a highly developed sense of responsibility—qualifications altogether essential to well-established home-life. Perhaps these contentions will become more apparent from a consideration, for instance, of the Church's moral law.

The Disciplinary Value of the Church's Moral Law.—The observance of the Church's moral law helps family life both directly and indirectly. Many of the obligations it insists upon are related directly to family life and their fulfillment makes for harmony and peace in the home. Others, again, fit and shape the individual for future family life, preparing him for the inevitable sacrifices of the home. They school the individual and develop within him moral character. Thus, for example, altogether basic in the Church's moral teaching is the concept of the common good, or the welfare of the group. The individual is constantly called upon to sacrifice himself for the common interests of the group. Both the good habits he is urged to acquire and the evil tendencies he is incited to combat, are largely based upon this concept. In many details of daily life the individual is constantly prompted to forego his own selfish interests and to sacrifice himself for the common welfare of the group: and since family life makes up such a considerable share of the day's activities, the self-denial expected of him very frequently has an intimate bearing upon home-life itself.

The Church's moral law regarding the regulations of the mating instinct, may serve as an example further to illustrate the possibilities in the whole field of ethical teaching for the development of a sense of self-mastery and self-discipline calculated to fit the individual for dutiful family life. The example, moreover, is particularly fitting because of the intimate relation of this instinct to familial life. Thus, in her ethics the Church rejects all gratification of the sex instinct apart from the responsibilities of family life. Any use of the instinct for purely selfish reasons is ever banned as fundamentally un-Christian. From earliest years children are prepared for the faithful observance of this law. They are consistently taught that any deliberate violation of the virtue of chastity in thought, word, or deed is seriously wrong. The constant effort and the fixed determination to live up to this standard carry with them many beneficial results that redound to the good of the individual and the group. The powerful instinct itself is curbed and given no opportunity to get the upper hand over the higher and more spiritual side of life. In the mastery of this powerful drive, the rule for habit formation must above all be observed that not one single lapse be allowed. Thus the individual is gradually prepared for the period of storm and stress that normally comes with the emergence of manhood and womanhood at adolescence, as well as for the normal hazards of courtship. And having learned the lesson of control in pre-nuptial days, proper regulation of the instinct within the marriage relation should be more reasonably assured than if they had been marked by license. In view of the immense amount of family turmoil due to sex incompatibility to-day, there is scarcely any danger of over-exaggerating the value of such a regulation as a discipline in the faithful observance of this moral law.

Quite aside from such incompatibility, however, the sense of control and self-mastery that the practice of this moral virtue develops in the individual, bears fruit in course of time in the form of wholesome family life. It disciplines the will of the individual, the backbone of all personal life, and facilitates self-conquest in other spheres besides that of sex. On the other hand, without such discipline, with license instead of self-mastery, the individual would become a victim of quite impersonal impulses and instincts. He is less completely master over himself here than in any other province of life. He is only too capable of an inconstancy that would harm both himself and his family life. The Church lends her aid in this situation by throwing the influence of her moral teaching against the animal freedom and the uncontrolled pleasure that not only enslaves the individual but also harms family life and hampers social progress. She safeguards the individual's conduct against temporary whim and undisciplined desire by means of her definite moral teaching. She realizes that men will not bow to the moral necessity of social life. She insists upon the sacrifices for the common good, for the welfare of the group.

And so, in like manner do other moral teachings of the Church redound to the good of family life. Constantly kept before the mind and insistently enforced from earliest days through a serious belief in the practice of the Christian religion, they naturally tend to make for the control of impulses and instinctive cravings of nature that, left to themselves, would grow rank weeds of vice. They would prove injurious to society in general and to those, more particularly, with whom the individual comes into frequent and intimate contact in the activities of daily family life. They place the interests of the group over the interests of the individual. They discipline the individual and imbue him with a sense of duty and responsibility that fit him for the inescapable sacrifices and hardships of family life.

Asceticism, a Discipline of Life.—The Church has other means of promoting a discipline of life besides the ordinary observance of the moral law. Foremost among these means is the practice of asceticism. The term asceticism is here taken primarily in the sense of self-denial. The Church sees the great moral and social value of the ascetic ideal and has always upheld it. She has ever recognized the fact that natural life does not flourish unless the spirit retains the upper hand. She realizes, on the one hand, that without some element of the ascetic there can be no really ideal home-life nor any other satisfying social relation, and, on the other, that with a good measure of asceticism mankind can be lifted to highest and most wholesome levels of culture and social life.

The Church does not, however, believe in an asceticism that amounts to an extirpation of natural forces. She takes her stand between the two extremes of a negation of nature and an excess of uncontrolled freedom, or an extreme self-realization that stamps in selfishness and begets the asocial child and the puerile and irresponsible adult. Infantile characters are in no sense equipped for the serious responsibilities and tasks of family life.

The ascetic does not merely observe the ordinary law. He aims higher, striving after the extraordinary and performing the supererogatory. The ascetic ideal is particularly carried out by those who voluntarily take upon themselves the practice of the evangelical counsels, the vows, namely, of chastity, poverty, and obedience. Hundreds of thousands have voluntarily opposed three of the most powerful drives in human nature by the observance of the three customary vows of religious life. Their lives reach into the heroic to a greater or lesser degree. Their example serves as a stimulus to others to discipline their own lives at least to the extent of living up to the essentials of the moral law.

Thus by the vow of poverty the individual gives up whatever goods of this world he may possess and even foregoes the right to acquire property and hold it in his own name. This solemn promise is opposed to what the Scriptures call the ''concupiscence of the eyes,'' or what the modern psychologist terms the tendency towards acquisitiveness. Anyone familiar with the family turmoil caused by economic tension in the home and by frantic efforts to ''keep up with the Joneses,'' can readily understand how the example of this vow can redound in many ways to the good of family life. Such a disinterested attitude towards the material goods of this world on the part of a moderate proportion of individuals in a community should serve to check in others the drive of acquisitiveness that tends to place the material above all the higher values of social life.

The vow of chastity is opposed to the ''concupiscence of the flesh'' or, in modern terminology, to the mating instinct or sex. Voluntary self-denial of even that which is licit in this sphere serves as a wholesome example, encouraging others to discipline themselves at least to the extent of keeping within the bounds set by the moral law regarding the use of this instinct. The vast amount of familial friction caused through sex incompatibility resulting from an unholy freedom in the use of this instinct would suggest the possibilities for good to home-life in the example given by this vow of chastity.

The vow of obedience is opposed to the scriptural ''pride of life'' or to some elements in the psychologist's ''self-assertiveness.'' Voluntary submission to a superior, or the giving up of one's will, is an example much needed in a modern world that has long been fed upon the doctrine of ''do as you please.'' Particularly too is the example and influence of this vow needed to-day when there is a change in the status of the different family members, and when much harm in resulting from attempted rationalization of conduct on the part of the younger generation. Respect for authority will be doubly necessary until these developments get further beyond their experimental stages.

The extent of the influence that the ascetic ideal must have exerted during the Middle Ages may be grasped in part, at least, when it is realized that during the fifteenth century there were in Europe 37,000 houses of Benedictine religious alone. And there is every need for the influence of the ascetic principle in the modern world of to-day. The greater the disturbance of outer things, the more indispensable is the emphasis upon the spiritual factor in life. In the face of the immense suggestive power of wealth, ambition, and sensuality in the world, both the individual and the family stand much in need of the example of those who make themselves independent of these influences by voluntarily taking upon themselves the practice of the evangelical counsels. Both individual and family stand in need of the example of those who, by foregoing all material gain and the outward claims of the world and by a cultivation of a deep faith in the spiritual destiny of man, have secured a mastery over the whole world of material attraction. By being able to point to such example the Church can more readily impel others to a discipline of asocial tendencies in themselves and to a proper regulation of forces that may become harmful to family life.

Some ascetic practice, moreover, is expected in the lives of all of the Church's members. Thus, the Church has her penitential season of Lent, her Friday abstinence, and other ways in which she urges the individual to deny himself over and above that demanded by the ordinary law.

The Idealism of the Church.—The Church not only points to those of this world who practice the evangelical counsels as an example for imitation, but she also holds up for imitation the example of the saints. From the great earnestness and decision of these spiritual heroes who have fought and won their battle of life, there radiates a suggestive influence of incomparable power that strengthens the shifting will of man and impels to a self-discipline that will at least meet the requirements of the moral law. At the highest peak of her ideals stands the example of the perfect model—Christ. Furthermore, there are the ideals inculcated by the beatitudes and those flowing from the devotions in honor of the Blessed Virgin. In fact, through the whole vast scheme of Christian theory and practice there runs an element of idealism, serving to draw the individual to higher and higher levels and to discipline the individual. And a disciplined individual is a fundamental requirement for successful family life.

By her insistence upon the observance of the moral law, therefore, as well as by her asceticism and idealism the Church seeks to discipline the individual and the very movements of life. The drift of life is down-stream, towards ever lower and lower levels, and without discipline the family would also drift along. It would drift with every whim of selfishness in the currents of passion, of confused values, and uncontrolled freedom. A discipline of life is necessary to direct family life in accordance with the Christian ideal. It is necessary to preserve it from disintegrating internal strife and to save it from being swamped in the gulf of selfishness and depravity. The Church made a remarkable contribution to the family life of the past by upholding such a discipline. And her influence is very much needed for this purpose to-day.

THE CATHOLIC CONFESSIONAL

From a vast field of religious practices of the Church that may benefit home-life only one example is chosen here—the confessional. Among the many values of the confessional, some are of a constructive nature, some are preventive, and others again curative. Home-life may be affected thereby both indirectly and directly, that is, by shaping or fitting individuals who are to found families or by promoting harmonious relations among family members within the domestic world itself.

The Confessional and the Socialization of the Individual.—Quite prevalent is the notion that the confessional is intended only for the forgiveness of sin. The confessional is a much more far-reaching instrument of the spiritual life. It has great constructive value. Under the able direction of the confessor who is familiar with the science of the spiritual life, the individual can be led on to build up his own spiritual life, particularly through the practice of different virtues, through formation of wholesome habits. The confessional affords many an opportunity to sow the seeds of virtue. Moreover, it is precisely at the time of confession that the individual's disposition is usually at its best, when the soil is most fit to make the seeds of virtue take root and sprout. A repeated and successful practice of virtue socializes the individual. The very satisfaction and happiness that go with a faithful practice of virtue is beneficial to him. He gains a sense of confidence and control in doing good that is very helpful to his spiritual life. In the practice of the social virtues, as elsewhere, nothing succeeds like success. And certainly the virtuous individual is normally better fitted for family life than is the vicious.

Whenever the individual's better and more social impulses are fostered and drawn out, these, rather than the more asocial tendencies, will get the upper hand. A positive practice of virtue is at least a negative discouragement of vice. But, more directly also is the confessional brought to bear on the individual's asocial tendencies, curbing them by means of renewed resolution and the repeated efforts that are essential parts of the sacrament. Even where there may be a slip, and a socially harmful instinct momentarily gets the upper hand, a humble acknowledgment of the fault and the acceptance of the penance imposed makes of the slip not a success but a failure; and nothing fails like failure. As a result the habit will not be so readily impelled to manifest itself again in asocial ways as it would if it had simply been permitted the individual to accept the gratification afforded through his fault. Beginning its guidance in the earliest years after the use of reason is reached, the confessional becomes a powerful influence in shaping the individual for his future family life by directly seeking to curb all tendencies that might later prove detrimental to happy home-life.

The Confessional and Harmonious Family Life.—More directly the confessional helps family life by nipping in the bud tensions in the home before they have an opportunity to mature and take on proportions. Friction of various kinds in the home may injure the fabric of family life and cause it to decay. Frequently the rifts caused thereby are mended, and even the causes of friction are removed by voluntary self-accusation in the sacred tribunal of penance. In this way the sacrament of penance becomes the stitch in time that saves nine—and often saves the home. Some domestic turmoil must be expected. It is simply a part of the product of life that cannot be entirely avoided. But the faithful reception of the sacrament of penance speedily halts unwholesome growths that would prove detrimental to the home. Its repeated reception serves to check the little difficulties and roughnesses of daily life that threaten to pit family members against one another and lead to harmful tensions and even eventual domestic disunion.

Husband and wife, for example, who make proper use of the confessional at least monthly will hardly give a real opportunity to misunderstandings that might occur to develop fully and to become deep-seated. Ill feelings are not allowed to root themselves deeply in the heart and to grow rank weeds of hatred that can only be eradicated with greatest difficulty, if at all. And, as a matter of fact and actual practice, there are to-day as in the past, hundreds of thousands who avail themselves of this privilege not only monthly, but even weekly and more often. While, even with the most faithful use of the confessional, some minor slips may still occur because of the drive of the elemental forces of human nature and the circumstances of life, still, permanent or serious harm is not very likely to result. The possibility of serious harm to family life is largely shut off through a faithful use of the sacrament of penance.

Furthermore, even if some deep-seated cause of family trouble has developed or if some harmful habit, such as quarrelsomeness or preferring self to the good of the group, has fixed itself in the individual, the situation is not necessarily a hopeless one. If the individual receives the grace of a proper disposition for the reception of the sacrament and makes faithful and frequent use thereof, his renewed resolution and repeated effort may build up anew a strong and healthy willpower and even work a satisfactory cure.

So too does the confessional go far in assuring the faithful discharge of essential duties of parents towards children and, vice versa, of children towards parents. All serious Catholics are imbued with the realization that they are answerable before God for the spiritual welfare of the children entrusted to their parental care. How they have fulfilled this duty will be one of the chief obligations of their state of life, about which they will seriously bethink themselves before confession. Accusation in the confessional of any remissness of which they may have found themselves guilty will be accompanied by an expression of sorrow for their negligence. The whole matter is viewed as a serious obligation before God. Self-realization is not to the fore.

In the case of the children the situation is much the same. On their part confession means a renewed effort to fulfil their obligations of filial respect and obedience towards their parents and to correct any conduct that might promote disharmony in the family circle. A sincere accusation in the very presence of God accompanied by an expression of sorrow for past failure and a renewed resolve to resist such weakness in the future, are taken to be essentials in this sacrament.

There can be no doubt that these practices repeatedly bring renewed spirit and effort into the home and that they go far in enforcing the observance of the Christian law regarding the interrelations of the family members and thereby they promote harmony within the group. Of no small import furthermore, so far as family life is concerned, is the undoubted fact that a child will more readily respect the authority of parents who voluntarily by such an act of humility as confession, acknowledge their dependence upon and allegiance to a higher power. And parental authority is one of the keystones in the unity of the family group.

Effects of the Practice of Confession upon Life.—The confessional does its best work when the penitent keeps himself continually under the guidance of one and the same confessor. In such cases the ministrant of the sacrament comes to know the recipient thoroughly, his weaknesses and his strength, his ways and very habits of life. There are, of course, untold advantages in this. The social-worker, for example, has come to see the value of thoroughly studying and treating the individual delinquent. This idea has long been carried out in the Catholic confessional and it can there be utilized in a high degree.

In the reception of the sacrament itself, all the different steps—the examination of conscience, the sorrow for guilt, the purpose of amendment, the willingness to accept the penance imposed—all go far toward settling those disturbed emotions which the individual tends to magnify from trifling tiffs into trying tensions. All tend further to dispose the soul to accept guidance from the confessor and to conform itself to the workings of God's grace. Anger, revenge, envy, jealousy, and hate—all such powers of darkness that cloud the soul so that it cannot see or judge aright are weakened, if not even driven away. The individual strives to set aside self and to see his soul as it is before God. The ideas of duty and obligation are uppermost. The common good and not self is the measuring rod. Obligations towards mate and children or family group rather than selfish convenience or fanciful whim are paramount. And above all, there stands the obligations towards God as the thought supreme. Thus, a spirit of fairness will motivate the individual, whereas opportunity for selfishness to manifest itself in its myriad forms is practically shut off. The spirit of forgiving and asking forgiveness predominates. And, when the whole difficulty concerned has been weighed under the veil of secrecy, the judgment of the unprejudiced and impartial judge of the case is whole-heartedly accepted and abided by. Above all, besides the natural helps and even scientific technique of the confessional that is brought to bear, there is at work in the sacrament the supernatural grace of God. Those who faithfully use grace in their daily lives may also confidently expect its assistance in time of particular difficulties. As far as family difficulties are concerned, the sacrament of matrimony particularly makes provision for the necessary graces to meet the trying situations that may arise.

Wholesome family life has much indeed to gain from this instrument of the spiritual life and channel of grace—the

Catholic confessional. If acknowledged by all and faithfully practised, this sacrament would aid immensely in the reëstablishment of the modern home. Nor is there anything else that can satisfactorily take its place. There is no other individual who has both the necessary qualifications of the confessor and such an institution as the confessional to work through for the readjustment of familial difficulties and for the reintegration of family life. Not only is the minister a highly qualified ethicist, equipped with knowledge and a definite grasp of moral laws, but he is also afforded every opportunity to apply the law and make adjustment in an intelligent and impartial way because of the secrecy and sacredness of the tribunal of penance. The entire procedure is enveloped in a veil of secrecy and all damaging publicity is rendered impossible. It is, moreover, accompanied by a sense of the sacred, while all influences that might cloud the judgment of the confessor or affect the adjustment of the case are removed. All who really value the home can readily see the advantages of this sacrament even as a natural means for helping family life. Many, of course, cannot grasp its supernatural merits. Some may not admit either its natural or its supernatural power and influence. Some, for instance, will be prejudiced against it because of the element of self-abasement it demands—noble and even chivalrous though it be. The selfishly inclined will have little use for it because it places human welfare and the common good above self-realization. Many object to the restraint of the moral law it upholds and applies. Yet without precisely these things, little can be done to re-integrate the modern home.

The Whole System of the Church Necessary.—Several of the means by which the Church can help to reorganize modern family life have been indicated. Yet, helpful as these particular means are, they are not all-sufficient in themselves. A complete solution demands the entire system of the Church and a faithful living out of all her essential practices. Thus, the sacrament of penance is indeed a great aid to harmonious family life. Yet the sacrament of matrimony is also necessary. In fact, all the sacraments of the Church are necessary, since family life is not something set apart from the rest of life. And so likewise are all other means and methods of the Church necessary. Both her natural and supernatural helps must be used. Left merely to the natural, society tends to drift downward towards ever lower and lower levels. The help of the supernatural, however, enables it ever to aspire effectively after higher and higher levels.

The Church has always, in her efforts to prepare the individual for suitable adjustment to social life as well as to life eternal, drawn upon the best that the storehouse of human knowledge and science can offer. This she has ever linked up with both supernatural motives and supernatural means. She wishes her members to use their intelligence in their efforts towards spiritual headway. She teaches them to make use of such scientific tools of the spiritual life as the examination of conscience, the particular examen, and meditation, by means of which they can delve deep down into the spiritual disorders that may be within, get at the fundamental causes and apply the remedy there. Such practices are not only psychologically sound, but antedate by far our knowledge of some of the laws of modern psychology. And they go far in equipping the individual for the assumption of familial responsibilities.

Behind her natural means, however, there ever stands the dynamic force of supernatural grace that strengthens him against inherent weakness and prepares him for wholesome social life as well as for the tasks that marriage and family life entail. Anyone who grasps the full meaning of the theory and practice of the Church's system can readily see how far-reaching the faithful use of her natural and supernatural means must be in developing will-power and self-control, a sense of responsibility and good habits, and in shaping the individual for dutiful family life in various other ways.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. What is done in your parish that is beneficial to home life? What might be added?
2. What other doctrines or practices of the Church, besides those mentioned in this chapter, affect family life?
3. In what ways is social work beneficial to home-life?
4. What is a family clinic?
5. How do religious communities render social-service which lightens the burdens of families and of the State?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

See Chapter IV.

CHAPTER XIX

Modern Family Resources

The modern family has suffered much because of lack of premarital preparation and from a want of intelligent care in the selection of a mate. These matters demand greater diligence and more painstaking effort to-day than was the case in an earlier culture. They are not taken care of so automatically to-day as in the past. Moreover, the family is more dependent upon the various organs of the community to-day than was formerly the case. More than ever before does it need the help of such institutions as the Church, the State, and the school, in order that it may function effectively and fulfil its purposes satisfactorily.

Still, even the most careful preparation and the most intelligent selection of a mate can do no more than guarantee a favorable and promising start to a new family venture, and a trustworthy foundation whereon to build the superstructure of the home. And in the building of the supperstructure the help of the various institutions of the community will avail little unless there are sufficient resources within the familial unit itself to assure a reasonable degree of inherent integration. Moreover, these family resources must be used to the best advantage if the modern family is to be reconstructed and to function in a satisfactory manner. Familial resources of the past have been affected by modern environmental changes and in many an instance their efficacy has in great part been lost. Various bonds that formerly helped to bind the group have been weakened and in some instances they have entirely disappeared. Many interests that formerly served to unite the family members through mutual coöperation, and that lent effective aid in the task of training children in the home, have shifted to extra-domestic realms. Those that still remain within the home have the appeal of an ever-increasing number of alluring extra-domestic interests to compete with.

This chapter will be devoted to a taking of stock, to an investigating of the family resources or the matrimonial capital on hand for the building of successful families or the reconstruction of the modern home. While there have been losses, there have also been gains. Much, too, of the past still remains. But it is above all worthy of note that a more careful and intelligent use of the resources that remain is essential to-day. Habit and custom and the merely automatic system of an earlier day will no longer prove satisfactory in constructing or reconstructing the home.

Affection as a Family Resource.—While the natural bond of human love has been somewhat affected by modern conditions it undoubtedly contains within itself great possibilities for the building of vigorous families and the conservation of the modern home. Particularly when strengthened and purified by the spirit of religion is human love far and away the chief mainstay, the greatest resource of modern family life. In fact, where the tie of affection remains strong and vigorous one can expect to find a well-established and high type of family life even in cases where the more external bonds, such as the economic and industrial, may have entirely disappeared. This bond of affection, moreover, not only draws the members of the family group together in harmonious unison, but it also provides the motive that leads parents to make the greatest sacrifices and efforts in behalf of their children in order to assure them health, comfort, and sufficient training for life. These efforts of parents for children, in turn, awaken in the latter motives that will cause them to exert themselves in answer to those efforts. Founded in nature itself, affection is more fundamental and lasting by far than the bonds that depend upon the extra-domestic environment, or upon the particular culture of a time.

Yet love can be repressed or starved out on the one hand while, on the other, it can be made to develop to full maturity. In the former case, no home would be altogether safe or satisfactory; in the latter, family solidarity and a high type of home-life would be assured. To-day there is particular need of emphasis upon the fact that affection needs careful cultivation.

The Cultivation of the Affections.—In an earlier civilization the cultivation of the affections was brought about quite automatically through the presence within the home circle of many common interests and activities of work and play that have since in part disappeared. But in our present complex civilization, familial affection can not be left to depend so much upon the common interests, or upon mere impulse. Even when a full-fledged family exists, even where the threefold relationship—between husband and wife, brothers and sisters, parents and children—is found, a family spirit must be cultivated. The many fascinating attractions and interests outside the home need to be counteracted through special and conscious efforts to develop a sense of family love and loyalty. And the bond of affection is needed all the more to-day because other bonds have been weakened, because the pleasure philosophy of the day demands greater satisfactions in family life than formerly, and because many human needs can be met outside the family to-day that formerly could not so be taken care of.

Various resources may help in the cultivation of the affections. Such qualifications as good health, pleasant disposition, and adequate income, may not positively and directly promote the growth of affection, but frequently their absence will in all likelihood hamper the normal development of familial love. An attraction for home-life, however, and similarity of interests, ideals, and tastes, on the part of family members, serve directly to foster affection. Then, too, there are innumerable little opportunities in daily life that can be used for this purpose if conscious effort is put forth. Ownership of one's home together with the values of the association of place can help along too in developing loyalties. Again, properly regulated sex and, above all, the normal development of the parental impulses, contribute a share. Some further attention may well be devoted to each of these items.

A Community of Interests and Familial Love.—If a family begins with an endowment of companion interests and new ones are added as time goes on, love and happiness are practically assured in the home. Such common interests, actively participated in by all members of the family group readily add to the fun and richness of the home-life. If active interest is out of the question, a passing interest, a pride for instance in another's achievement, should not be wanting. A mother may have little appreciation of music, for example, and still be able to show an encouraging interest in the musical endeavors of her children. Here especially, do we see the value of parents' interest in their children's hobbies and in all their work and play, as a means of cultivating the latter's love and loyalty towards the home and of increasing their regard and respect for their parents. If, on the other hand, contact between parent and child were only in the stern attitude of correction and punishment, the child would be repelled and its finer sentiments of love and devotion repressed or even stamped out. As far as husband and wife are concerned, their interests to-day will have to come increasingly from cultural and intellectual sources as economic and industrial interests within the home wane. Still, it is true that with work so largely removed from the home as it is to-day, the wife can show an intelligent interest in the husband's business or professional affairs that will go far in promoting the growth of a wholesome love and affection between the pair.

Affection and the Little Things of Life.—There are many apparently trifling little attentions that contain within themselves great possibilities for the promotion of family affection. The ordinary courtesies and conventions, seemingly insignificant at times, may go very far towards fostering love between mates, while their neglect readily leads to the familiarity that breeds contempt and starves affection. The simple rule of being as courteous within the home as in the extra-domestic world would do very much to prevent family friction and to build up a sense of love and loyalty within the home. And such courtesy should be characterized by deep sincerity rather than by stilted formality, for it is the genuine spirit rather than artificial polish that counts. Particularly on the part of women do little favors, especially of the surprise and unexpected type, bulk large and mean much to them. Such, however, would mean little to the man.

In general, more conscious effort is needed on his part to foster love. There is considerable danger that he center a disproportionate amount of his energy and attention in business affairs and too little in the task of enriching the spirit of love and loyalty in his home. His love is less effusive than woman's and his less romantic temperament may more readily permit love to grow cold.

The possibilities contained in this thought of fostering love by means of the little things of life are shown by an instance occurring in a rural village that was brought to the writer's attention. One of the outstanding leaders in this community was a high type of cultured gentleman, the father of a splendid family. As storekeeper in the chief general-merchandise store in the community, he was brought into constant contact with a large number of the people of the immediate neighborhood and surrounding community. Reared elsewhere himself, many things in the culture of these people struck him when he first moved into their midst. Thus, he noted among other things the attitude of the men toward their wives. While there was no evidence of cruelty, for instance, or non-support, neither was there any effort occasionally to get out of the routine rut and bring a little pleasure or variety into their lives. The wives were, so to speak, taken for granted, and no effort was made to bring any diversion into their monotonous and routine-like lives. Gradually the merchant adopted the practice of suggesting to the men, as they came to buy tobacco, that such and such an article in his stock might mean something to the purchasers' wives. At one time it was a bit of fruit, at another some sweets, or again a flower vase or other decoration. At first the reaction on the part of the men was unfavorable. They considered the matter but a trick on the part of the merchant to inveigle them out of their money. But after he hinted rather broadly that such items might mean as much to their wives as the tobacco meant to themselves, they changed their attitude. Many of them, in fact, made a regular practice of buying incidentals that undoubtedly meant much to their life-partners.

In this particular case the main factor was the individual who did the little original thinking for the others. The result was more conscious effort on the part of all. And who would doubt that the family spirit in the community was not very considerably improved thereby, and that much happiness in individual families resulted?

Domesticity and Affection.—Love can best be cultivated and enriched within the confines of the home circle. Where there is attraction for home-life on the part of husband and wife, there will also be a real home atmosphere and the family hearth will be a haven of rest and contentment. Commonly the creation of a home atmosphere, or the feathering of the family nest, depends more upon the efforts of the wife and mother than upon those of the husband and father, since the latter's work takes him so extensively outside the home. However, the latter can also play a part and it will particularly mean much to him to find his home a true haven of rest in which to recreate himself after the struggles and anxieties of a business day. The contrast that the quiet of an attractive home will afford to the sharpness of the modern commercial and social activities outside the home, will make the former appeal to the man and will tend to draw out all the finer sentiments of love and affection within him. On the other hand, the absence of an attractive home spirit and perchance even the presence of storm clouds hovering low on the domestic horizon, may cause him to react with all the greater displeasure because of the high pitch and tension of modern extra-domestic activity. Nor must the outer world be allowed to intrude within the sacred precincts of the home. The home must in reality be a little world set apart from the turmoil and strife of the great outside world. Only in such case can there be the real spirit of domesticity or attraction for home-life that will cultivate and foster familial love and affection.

Home Ownership and the Association of Place.—The individual members of the family group are first and foremost the objects in which family love and loyalty are embodied. But it is also true that the home hearth itself can, to a very considerable extent, become the embodiment of such sentiments, particularly so because of the association of place. This is much the same as with patriotism. The latter is an abstract sentiment that is largely linked up with the very geography of a country. It is even embodied in the soil, in the "rocks and rills," the "woods and templed hills." So, in like manner, can the houses in which we live become, to a great extent, the embodiment of family affection. This truth is beautifully and strikingly expressed by the following lines of a modern writer:[1] "Blessed is the home in which for a whole lifetime associations have been gathering, until every figure in the carpet and even every panel of the door, and every casement of the window has a chirography of its own, spelling out something about father, or mother, or son, or daughter, or friend that was with us for a while. What a sacred place it becomes when one can say: in that room such a one was born; in that bed such a one died; in that chair I sat on the night I heard such a one had received a great public honor; by that stool my child knelt for her last evening prayer; there I stood to greet my son as he came back from a sea voyage; that was my father's cane; that was mother's rocking-chair! What a joyful and pathetic congress of reminiscences!" Family sentiment at-

[1] Talmadge, T., *The Wedding Ring*, p. 159.

taches itself to the old and familiar things. Age may have robbed the latter of an earlier beauty, but at the same time it has softened and mellowed them. As the son sees beauty in the care-worn face of his mother, so the lover of his home sees a beauty therein that dispels even that which is drab and lacking in fairness. He sublimates and idealizes it until it rouses and quickens his emotions.

But for all these things ownership of the home and stability of residence is necessary. The constant moving about from place to place and from house to house, the lack of ownership of the home property and use of other people's goods, make quite impossible any development of this sentiment so as to nurture it and bring it into full bloom. More home-ownership would undoubtedly go far in fostering a sense of just pride in one's home and would give new growth to family affection and loyalty. On the other hand, there is little chance for the development of such sentiments on the part of the little modern child that remarked, "There is one of the houses in which I was born." Such a situation is unfortunate for family life.

Sex as a Family Resource.—The mating instinct, or the physical element in the love complex, may minister to the spiritual or psychic side of love and thus foster wholesome and harmonious family life. (On the other hand, it can also become a very detrimental influence to family life. If sex is to foster the higher and more spiritual elements of love, it must be properly regulated. Certain attitudes towards it must be cultivated and certain hazards guarded against.) It is essential, for example, that the use of the sex instinct within marriage be looked upon not only as something lawful but also as something partaking of the nature of a strict right. It must be considered a right that husband and wife freely confer upon each other through the marriage contract and, consequently refusal to grant the right is to be looked upon as a breach of contract and an injustice. Any other attitude would leave the door open for much so-called sex incompatibility, and would become the source of a host of marital and familial tensions. There are, of course, reasons for refusal at times. Adequate reasons would be, for instance, grave danger of life, danger to health through contagion, and similar dangers. But under these special conditions, refusal should not be necessary. A spirit of mutual love and affection should be an all-sufficient guide at such times. A tender and considerate thoughtfulness for each other and, moreover, a reasonable self-mastery and self-restraint is altogether in place within the marriage union. A surfeit of sexual indulgence will rather drive out spiritual love than minister to it. It robs mates of the higher satisfactions and deeper joys of ideal love. It leaves them on the animal level of the physical.

The Parental Impulse.—Even when the mating instinct is duly regulated and used considerately, mere physical attraction tends rather to dwindle than to increase in course of time. Standing alone, it can not ordinarily be a satisfactory basis for permanent marriage. But when parenthood is added to a duly regulated sex instinct and a normal affection between mates, the resultant combination usually becomes a powerful influence, serving not only to bolster up the home but also to make it a supreme source of enduring happiness and contentment. Beyond doubt, the play of the parental impulses enormously increases the matrimonial capital of the pair.

In the past, children commonly came into the home during the earliest years of marriage and this added a new element of common sympathy to home-life. This embedded itself in the life of the normal man and woman as mere physical attraction began to lose some of its fascinating appeal. Decrease in the latter was accompanied by a shared love of offspring that served to enrich and deepen the mutual love that already existed between the mates. Parenthood meant a new source of joy within the home. It meant a love constantly fed and sustained by the parents' sacrifices and their unselfish services to their children.

Marriage sympathy most naturally centers in children. They are the parents' treasures and main sources of interest. And next to the possession of a treasured interest, there is no richer experience than the sharing of it with another to whom it means much the same. Because they must work out together the destiny of the children given them, the parents find a mutual interest more cohesive than perhaps any other binding power within the domestic world. There is not for them anything more engrossing than the triumphs connected with the physical, mental, and moral development of their offspring. Other companion interests undoubtedly are helpful in fostering affection, but even when these are lacking, the common interest and awakened sympathy that show themselves as husband and wife bend over the cradle of their little one, or plan together for those who are "flesh of their flesh and bone of their bone," draw them together as no other influence can do. It has ever been the experience of the race that the average man and woman find in parenthood one of the greatest sources of joy and satisfaction.

The inherent parental impulse is as pronounced in human nature to-day as it was in the past. Parenthood still has the same power to enhance love and to strengthen and ennoble it that it formerly had. But as a matter of fact, its influence is not operating in the same measure in the modern family as it did in that of the past, and for the simple reason that parenthood is no longer so extensively found as in days gone by. Deliberately childless marriages and restricted families have become exceedingly popular in modern life and, as a result, parental impulses have been left hidden in their germinal state, or have but partially developed. Thus there has been cut away from husband and wife the source of permanent interest and attraction, which lasts even after physical charm dies and all other interests have been exhausted. Childless homes are lonely homes. There is a void in them that nothing else can fill. Such arrested families fail to give the marital pair the supreme happiness of parenthood. The genuine sympathies and common interests that find a place in homes with children strengthen the fundamental bond of affection and help to build a well-organized domestic world.

INDUSTRIAL INTERESTS

In the case of the industrial bond, there has been both loss and gain to the family. There is the undoubted fact pointed out before, that work has been in great part taken out of the home and that the industrial interests of the family members have become very generally diverse and separative. Moreover, there is no evidence to date to suggest that the present industrial situation will noticably change in the near future, and the factory again give way to some system of domestic industry. Hence the need of adjusting the home in the best possible manner to the new situation.

Some Benefits to Family Life.—That certain kinds of work have been taken out of the home is beyond doubt a very real benefit to family life. No one would approve, for instance, of the home-work that obtains under what is known as the sweating system. The home conditions involved therein make a normal and satisfying family life quite impossible.

Another undoubted gain to the family is the removal of certain kinds of work from the home. Thus the removal of the more mechanical work and physical drudgery has made possible a greater expenditure of effort on the higher and more ideal things of home-making. The less the home is industrialized, the more may it be personalized. The more the mother's physical work is reduced in the home, the more time and attention can she devote to personal values and human needs if she so chooses. Very many functions found in the homes of an earlier day have, as a matter of fact, been removed to-day. Moreover, this stripping process will undoubtedly continue for some time to come. If the resources of art, music, literature and the higher and more spiritual things of life generally, are given more place and attention in the home, as the laundry tub and mop, the sewing machine and range, are removed therefrom, the ultimate result can only be a distinct gain for family life. The home as a personality process and human experience is something far higher than the home that is preoccupied with merely the more physical and mechanical processes of life. The industrial changes, as far as the home is concerned, have therefore opened up some very genuine opportunities for raising family life to higher levels that were impossible under the old system. It is socially of the utmost importance that these new opportunities be accepted and made the most of.

Some Losses the Family Has Suffered.—The industrial changes, however, have not been an unmixed gain for the home. There have been losses, as indicated before, and losses that have been very real. Thus similar work interests in and about the home that had formerly done much to bind the family members together and to provide that contact between parent and child which furthered the latter's training, are found far less extensively in the average urban home to-day. Modern industrial changes, and the resultant economic and social conditions, are tending to create an ever-widening gulf between parent and child, and to separate family members generally. Yet the situation is not altogether a hopeless one. In spite of the fact, for instance, that much of the work of the family members is out of the home and is different in kind on the part of the individual workers, some interest in one another's work may still be stimulated. Thus there is no reason why the wife cannot show an intelligent interest in the work of her husband; or again why the parents cannot be concerned about the activities of their children. This, it is true, will call for more planned effort to-day than was the case in the past. Yet the effort is well worthwhile, for companion interests go very far in cementing familial bonds.

More particularly, however, is planned effort necessary today in order to bring about the contact between parents and children that is so essential for the latter's training. Since there can be no training at a distance, the companionship that formerly was brought about automatically through the ordinary activities of daily life, must to-day be definitely planned and sacrificed for. Perhaps the greatest difficulty is found on the part of the average father to-day. He also has a part to play in the training of the children, but the very force of industrial circumstances very considerably limits the contact between him and his children. Hence, he must by all means make the most of the time at home that is his in order that he may exert over them the influence so necessary for their normal development.

Gainfully Employed Mothers.—By far the least satisfactory family condition obtains, however, when the mother also works outside the home. And this problem of mothers in industry has become quite extensive to-day. It is moreover increasing. Various motives and factors play a part in inducing mothers to enter industry. Thus some voluntarily seek work outside the home. They are not forced by economic or other circumstances to do so. Merely a desire for a career or for money to spend on superfluities, a hankering after gregarious contacts or a lack of housekeeping experience, influence some in making the choice. It is agreed, however, that the vast majority of gainfully employed women work because they must. Thus it is estimated that in perhaps one-fourth of the urban low income groups, and in one-fifth of all families in large cities, wives are contributing to the family income. In these cases the father's wage simply does not suffice for the maintenance of a decent minimum standard of living.

In the case of the women who work because they must supplement an inadequate family income, the remedy obviously must be sought in the industrial and economic system itself. A family living-wage for the father will make unnecessary, extra-domestic employment of the mother. That would give wives and mothers the necessary opportunity to devote themselves to the tasks of home-making and child-rearing—not a part-time job by any means. Nor should such a living-wage be an idle dream in our land of plenty. It is altogether within the realm of the possible and any system of distributing our wealth that does not insure the laborer such a compensation for his work as will enable him and his family to live in frugal comfort, defeats even the minimum demands of justice. "Our economic system," writes R. A. McGowan,[2] "can be organized so as to need fewer workers and so as to pay all those who work, a decent wage. When that day comes fewer women will be in industry and trade, because their husbands and fathers will be able to support them, and because so many hands will not be required to supply our needs. More women will be in the home and they will have more time and money for the proper rearing of children, for self-culture and for activity as citizens and units of society. The importance of this cannot be questioned. It looks to a different ordering of society in which industry and trade will be less inefficiently organized, and in which all who work get a reasonable share of the great productivity of our country. It is important because it opens the way for greater regard for home-life, and for the good of society than is shown in an age when it is the normal and expected thing for women to leave home and take up petty, monotonous, stop-gap jobs. More of them will be free, when they do not marry, to enter more satisfying and better paid positions." Some countries—notably France and England—have to some extent adopted a system of family allowances in an effort to assure fathers of families a living wage.

Mothers Who Are Gainfully Employed by Choice.—The number of women who are seeking employment of their free choice is growing, it seems; women, too, who have assumed household responsibilities by marrying and through motherhood. This trend is in accord with an artificially stimulated spirit of the times and is anything but salutary socially. The threefold task of wifehood, home-making, and child care has customarily been found in the homes of the past, but the modern effort to add a fourth task—out-of-the-home work,—is to force an inevitable clash of duties. Furnished flats and modern conveniences in homes, for example, have indeed lightened the burden of home-making and given more time and energy for child care, but they have not set aside the essential conflict involved in motherhood and extra-domestic work. For the mother to work outside the home is for her to neglect the personal rearing and due training of her children.[3] "Anything that hinders this training is a big step backward for man, woman, child, and society. . . . The woman who works has no children, or else can not do justice to them, either physically before birth or mentally after birth. The modern biological idea is that the duties and privileges of the home when rightly understood are so incomparably more interesting and important than anything else in the world that the woman is justified in giving a large part of her time to them, while the man is justified in giving his time to earning money outside in order that his wife may be free to devote her attention to the work for which she is specialized. She has the best of the bargain."

---

[2] McGowan, R. A., *Women in Industry*, p. 29.

It is undeniably true that when we examine into the question of women in industry we encounter the biological fact that Nature itself has decreed them for the function of motherhood. Consequently whatever implications the condition of women in gainful extra-domestic occupations may have, their bearing upon the family and its functions, immediately and inevitably draws the spotlight of sociological attention. And it can hardly be pointed out too frequently today that the prime purpose of the family is not, as the *Zeitgeist* prompts, frivolous enjoyment, but the nurture and culture of the child. This major objective of the family, the physical, intellectual, and social development of the child, demands the intimate and affectionate association of family life. For the child whose mother works away from home that is impossible.

It is equally true also, that the function of child rearing is of the utmost importance to society as a whole, for upon it in great part depends the inculcation of habits of sympathy, coöperation, respect, obedience, reverence, thrift, industry, truthfulness, adherence to principle, and abhorrence of vice—all social virtues without which society cannot succeed, and without which, crime, vice, disease and kindred social disorders could but be expected. Hence the whole question of women in industry is highly significant socially, and must ever be evaluated in the light of the family function.

---

[3] Popenoe, P., *Modern Marriage*, p. 125.

A Modern Inconsistency.—Chesterton[4] points out the strange inconsistency in the modern attitude that stresses education as all-important socially, yet favors—not to say, flatters—the woman who works rather than the woman who stays at home. ''If you exalt education,'' he writes, ''you must exalt the parental power with it. If you exaggerate education, you must exaggerate the parental power with it. If you deprecate the parental power, you must deprecate education with it. If the young are always right; if they do not need education and guidance, then let us not talk of the importance of education. Make up your minds whether you want unlimited education or unlimited emancipation, but do not be such a fool as to suppose you can have both at once.'' Among the peculiar advantages of home education Chesterton especially stresses the fact that it is general and not particular or piecemeal. It gives, therefore, a general view or philosophy of life and a common-sense code of morals.

The same writer claims[5] that a more wholesome attitude is forming regarding women in industry and in the home. ''The cruder culture of merely commercialized emancipation is beginning to smell a little stale,'' he writes. ''People are no longer so sure that every housekeeper is prosaic and dull, while every bookkeeper is wild and poetical. Among the more intelligent the reaction is actually strengthened by all the most modern incitements about psychology and hygiene. We cannot insist that every trick of the nerves or train of thought is important enough to be searched for in libraries, and not important enough for anybody to watch by simply staying at home. We cannot insist that the first years of infancy are of supreme importance, and that mothers are not of supreme importance; or that motherhood is a topic of sufficient interest to men, but not of sufficient interest for mothers. Every word that is said about the tremendous importance of trivial nursery habits goes to prove that being a nurse is not trivial. All tends to return to the simple truth that the private work is the great work and the public work the small."

---

[4] Chesterton, G. K., "Turning Inside Out," in *Essays of Our Times*, p. 88.
[5] Ibid, p. 91.

Education might well be made use of to foster the growth of this newer and better trend with regard to women in industry and in the home. There is no doubt that the spirit of the times is still strongly in the opposite direction, and women and girls may well be shown that it is largely an illusion and is, moreover, socially harmful. It is an utterly inadequate education that will simply drift with the times even when that drift is detrimental to society. Hence the modern girl may well be taught the dignity and value, the interest and self-realization to be found in building the personality of her own children, and in constructing an ideal type of home that measures up to our civilization. She may well be imbued with the notion that women are fitted for higher things than industry and trade have to offer, and that positive harm is done her own higher good and the higher good of society, when many of them are transitory workers engaged in monotonous, ill-paid work in an unfree society. Only when she is emancipated from such subjection can she devote her talents and energies to far nobler things.

Mothers Who Do Not Work.—The manner in which mothers who do not work use their time and energies is also a matter of vital importance to the family and society. With the elimination of much mechanical and physical work from the home, mothers have been given greater opportunity and resources to raise the family to a higher cultural level. Moreover, the standards of the home have not remained stationary. Parenthood has become more complex and exacting. While mothers have been given relief, new possibilities in the field of both the nurture and culture of the child have been opened up to her. Quality has replaced quantity in the case of both house-keeping and parenthood responsibility. It is of the utmost importance that women use their new leisure time and resources in bettering the quality of home-life. A civilization cannot rise above the level of its family life. Neglect of the home, whether by choice or by force of circumstance is detrimental to any civilization.

Yet, withal, the door for the gainful employment of women should certainly be left open for such as wish to devote themselves to some definite work instead of marrying. There will always be at least a small group of these, and they have an ethical right to such opportunity. No woman's activities should be limited absolutely to the home. The modern home is not so self-sufficient as was the home of the past. It is much more dependent upon community resources, and is much more influenced by community conditions. Hence it is but to be expected that mothers are more interested in community activities to-day than in the past. A normal amount of such activity may be very helpful to them in making their work of education in the home more intelligent and practical. Furthermore, such extra-domestic interests will enable mothers to enrich their own individual and domestic life and to keep intelligently alert and active. It will make married life more satisfying. It will make for progressiveness rather than for retrogression in marriage. Popenoe,[6] for example, who stresses the values of the mother's work in the home, insists that "This does not mean that she should miss anything else that she wants and can profitably get. It means that her life should be enriched from outside in every way that is feasible, and that the man should also take much more active part in the home that he usually has taken. But with all this, specialization is the rule of progress, and the institution of matrimony is no exception. The theory of fifty-fifty marriage represents a past that is dead and should be buried. The whole feminist demand for the obliteration of sex distinction and an equal share in all the world's activities is scientifically unsound. From the biological point of view the keynote is differentiation." And the sociological view can hardly be different.

---

[6] Popenoe, P., *Modern Marriage*, p. 125.

OTHER FAMILY RESOURCES

Of the other family resources besides affection and industry that have helped to bind its members into an harmonious unison in the past—religion, authority, education, recreation, protection, and the economic factor—have been repeatedly referred to, particularly in their capacity of family bonds. Of these, the function of protection has all but disappeared from the home in our modern civilization. In the case of the other factors, however, while all of them have been somewhat affected, they still contain within themselves real possibilities for the reconstruction of family life. Brief attention will be given to each of these.

The Economic Factor.—The economic factor is closely allied to the industrial. Yet particularly under our wage system of to-day, it may well be looked upon as a distinct factor and as one that may or may not exert an integrating influence within the family group. Certain it is that family members may still pool their resources to-day as was so customarily done in the past, and thereby develop a sense of family solidarity. Furthermore, while many families are no longer common units of production to-day, they are still common units of consumption, and in this way again economic considerations may become a resource for the building of a strong family life. Still, it is undoubtedly true that the system of separate wages on the part of the family members tends to make for independence and separation. Parents may well look for ways and means of reasonably controlling this situation on the part of their children and of counteracting the tendencies that naturally flow therefrom.

Education as a Family Resource.—It has become quite the fashion to-day to think of education primarily, if not entirely, in terms of the school. This prominence given to school education has at least indirectly served to depreciate that of the home and caused it to lose caste. While it is true enough that in the present order of things parents are required by circumstances to seek the aid of the school if they are to fulfil their obligations with regard to the education of their children, the fact remains that home-training is the fundamentally important education. With every advance of the study of child psychology and kindred branches, the need of the home, and especially of the importance of the early years in the home, for the formation of character and the development of a complete personality in the child, becomes more apparent and convincing. Such home education, moreover, is even more necessary to-day than in the past if the child is to be properly fitted into our complex modern civilization. The school can never be anything more than a supplementary educational agency or an extension of the home. If the correct attitude regarding the relative merits of the family and of the school were popularized, and present faulty attitudes in the matter corrected, this would undoubtedly do much to increase the prestige and influence of the modern home. Education rightly understood can still be a very influential family resource.

Recreation, a Resource of the Home.—Urban congestion will undoubtedly continue to limit play facilities in and about the home, and commercialized recreation will still lure the members of many families unduly from the home hearth. Yet, recreation can still play a very real part in family life and be a worth-while resource in uplifting the modern home. To serve this purpose to-day, however, there must be much more definite planning and conscious effort than formerly on the part of the parents. Mere force of circumstances can no longer be depended upon to provide play interests in the home and its environs. With careful planning, however, the possibilities for common recreation within the home world are still many. There is, for example, much more leisure time in urban centers to-day that can be used for recreational purposes. Consequently, although the family members may be out of the home more than formerly, they can still be together very considerably for recreation if they but plan for it. With a little intelligent effort also, the time for recreation between parents and children can be made to count more. A few minutes' active participation in the play of children by a father or mother who has learned to unbend a little, or an active interest shown by the parents in their children's hobbies, may mean much more than many hours of mere haphazard and meaningless association. The radio is also a source of recreational attraction and appeal in many a home to-day. Again in the matter of extra-domestic recreation, there is no reason why parents and children cannot be together more to-day. For no small number at least, there is the possibility of auto trips, of week-end outings or of camping. And so one might continue the list showing that, in spite of all the change and cramping limitation in urban life, play can still be a very real family resource. The point that demands emphasis is that much more conscious effort is necessary to make this resource effective to-day.

Religion a Resource of the Family.—Religion has very commonly in the past proved to be a worth-while familial resource. While this factor has always been a very essential social force, it is safe to say that its influence is even more necessary in home life to-day than when the influence of social pressure held the individual to the path of duty. There is no evidence to suggest a possible return to the former small and stable group with its influence over the individual and family group. But this means little loss to the home in which a genuine religious spirit abides. The religious individual does not need to be under the eye of the group in order to restrain himself or to live up to his duties. He fulfils his familial and other obligations because he believes his one and every act and omission is visible to the all-seeing eye of God. Such constraint is far more effective than that which emanates from the social group.

As a matter of fact, however, such an influential religious spirit is not found in many a home to-day, and this means the partial loss of a very vital family resource. Yet, this need not at all be the case. While there is undoubtedly some relation between the modern lack of religion and the circumstances of present-day life, these circumstances in no wise render a sincere religious spirit and practice impossible. The truth of the matter is, that while there is indeed much irreligion to-day, there are still many homes in which religion is a most powerful and influential force.

Any Catholic priest, for instance, who has done parish work can readily vouch for the truly elevating and strengthening influence of religion in the homes of his people. Intangible a force though it be, there is no doubt about religion's integrating influence in the home, in the minds of those who have come into actual contact with its practice in family life. To cite an instance: the writer once gave particular attention to the religious side of family life in a study he made of urban and rural families. From the data acquired, perhaps the conclusion that most strongly suggested itself was that common religious practices in the home are more easily kept up in the country home than in the city. With all evidence pointing to a vigorous religious life in the city families interviewed, there was an evident falling off as far as religious practices within the home-circle itself was concerned. With regard to extra-domestic religious practices, which also very evidently exercised a wholesome influence over the family life, the evidence suggested that the same opportunities offered the people for the practice of their religion and the same inspiration and guidance given them, evidently produce much the same result in city and country. Certain it is that the contact with the families of his study irresistibly conveyed the impression to the writer that, very generally religion was a force at work in the lives of these people, a force that, among other things, also made for upright family life and for cohesion of family members. Religion served as a cement for the home and family in the past. Evidently it can be a resource of the home in the face of all change to-day. And by all means should it be cultivated both within and outside the home nowadays. Still, there is no doubt that religious practices in common within the home call for a little more definite planning today than in the past. In this also is the home hampered somewhat by out-of-the-home life. And this circumstance is likely to continue.

The Familial Resource of Authority.—Authority also has been an influential family resource in the past. It is moreover an essential element of the familial as well as of every other group to-day. Yet this notion of authority harmonizes none to well with the spirit of the times. Individualism has brought it not a little into disfavor. It is likely that, while the present process of a new re-alignment of family members towards each other stays under way, authority will remain less influential in family life than was the case under either patriarchal or semipatriarchal systems of the past. The ultimate result of this transitional stage, however, may be a much more ideal family life than that of the past, one, namely, in which authority will be much more closely allied with the elements of loyalty and love than with coercion and insistence upon rights, and with rules and cramping regulations.

If such an equalitarian type of family materializes it will be characterized by two wills and, in fact, by two complete personalities, yet at the same time by a harmonious mutuality. It will be organized upon the principles of equality of opportunity for self-expression and a habitual attitude of mutual aid towards each other, based on affection and a planned life-long coöperation between husband and wife. The two wills in the home will involve possibility of conflict and clash but will not necessarily imply actual disharmony. Indeed, the noblest harmonies of life arise when two disciplined and independent wills combine, and the truest comradeship is found when man and woman meet on the common ground of mutual interest and respect. In such a family, if difference of wish or view should develop, love and affection rather than law and authority will be the arbiters. Signs of affection rather than show of authority will predominate in the home. A spirit of compromise for the common good of the group instead of hard-and-fast rules regarding abstract questions of the rights of two individuals, or the particular spheres of husband and wife, will be uppermost. Full consultation between mates and complete recognition by each of the superior capacities of the other in their particular field or function will be the expected thing.

The two personalities in such a marriage would not be two selfish individuals, steeped in notions of self-realization, but rather would they be as much concerned for each other as for self, and both would aid one another in the attainment of a satisfying self-realization. The sacrificial element of love rather than the selfish would predominate, and precisely the greatest self-realization consists in sacrifice for others, particularly for those near and dear to one's self. Even in the natural order sacrifice is the law of self-expression and self-realization. It is a condition of art, for instance. Without it the individual becomes stagnant, surfeited with self, dissatisfied, and discontented. Without it there is no progressive and happy family life.

If two such individuals, therefore, have faced the meaning of marriage before it was undertaken; if they have taken normal precautions to rule out incompatibilities in advance; if they have definitely planned a life-long union devoted to the primary purpose of the family, the rearing of children, and are ready to make the sacrifices and vital personal adjustments entailed in living out a satisfactory and contented home-life after their marriage, in spite of all cultural change and of all weakening of the more external bonds of the family group, such a marital partnership can become the highest and most ideal type of family.

In general, the more spiritual, rather than the material resources, must be depended upon in the re-integration of the modern family. More conscious effort and more planned cultivation of the family resources that still remain is necessary. More and more will intelligent insight have to replace the automatic, or mere social custom and habit. Without stress upon these, familial disintegration will continue. With them the reconstruction of the home is altogether within the realm of possibility, and even a higher type of home than that of the past can well be expected.

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. What further family resources can you mention?
2. What are some specific ways in which family affection can be fostered?
3. What are some of the possibilities for making recreation more a family affair than it in reality is today?
4. What is the outlook for modern family reconstruction?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOSANQUET, H., *The Family,* Part II.
CHESTERTON, G. K., *Turning Inside Out; in Essays of Our Times* (edited by SHERBON BROWN), pp. 87–95.
COLCORD, J. C., "The Matrimonial Advice Bureau," *The Family,* Vol. V, No. 3.
DONNELLY, E. C., *Girlhood's handbook of women.*
DOUGLAS, P. H., *Wages and the Family.*
FARRAR, F. W., *Woman's Work in the Home.*
GERRARD, T. J., *Marriage and Parenthood,* Ch. XIII.
GROVES, E. R., *Social Problems of the Family,* Ch. XII.
GROVES, E. R. and OGBURN, W. F., *American Marriage and Family Relationships,* Chs. III, IV, VIII.
McGOWAN, R. A., "Women in Industry" (*N. C. W. C.* Publication).
NORRIS, K., "Laywoman Looks at 'Companionate Marriage'," *Catholic World,* Vol. CXXVII, pp. 257–287.
PARSONS, E. C., *The Family,* Ch. XV.
POPENOE, P., *The Conservation of the Family,* Parts III, IV.
SCHMIEDELER, E., *The Industrial Revolution and the Home.*
TALMADGE, T., *The Wedding Ring.*

CHAPTER XX

THE HOME AS AN EDUCATIONAL AGENCY

The family, the community, and the play group of children are the three primary groups of society. Of these institutions the family is the most nearly fundamental, for it is founded in man's needs. Its functions are manifold and varied. Society cannot exist without it. Assistance can be given the family in the fulfilment of its functions, but other institutions cannot become satisfactory substitutes for it. In fact, as society becomes more and more complex and other institutions multiply, the need for the family, it seems, becomes only the greater.

The Child the Center.—While the familial institution answers a need of both child and adult, it centers first and foremost in the child, inasmuch as its prime purpose is the propagation of the human race through the procreation and rearing of offspring. This is the race service expected of the home. This service to the race involves responsibility for the child's health, character, and usefulness in social life. The family microcosm is, furthermore, the first training school of the body, of the intellect, and of the will. This fact gives the family its prime importance and makes it rank as the most fundamental and essential of social institutions. Thus, the greater part of this final chapter will be devoted to these fundamental and essential duties of the family.

Birth and Physical Training.—If society is to be perpetuated, constant replacement is necessary. Children must be born to fill the ranks of those constantly passing into the great beyond. The monogamous family is the only one that can accomplish this important task in a satisfactory manner.

Anyone with but a superficial knowledge of the ravages of the social diseases can readily appreciate the contention of those who maintain that the parental factor and the home are essential elements for the production of even a physically sound stock.

The physical training of the child must begin with conception. Any strain upon the mother, mental or physical, may have a harmful effect upon the future well-being of the child. Since the unborn child derives its nourishment from the mother, it is of great importance that she herself be in the best physical health during the period of gestation.

The family is in the same manner an essential factor in the great plan for the preservation of life after the child's birth. The human infant is truly a helpless and dependent creature. For long years it needs tender care and constant supervision and guidance. Woman is especially the kind nurse supplied by Nature. Normally it falls to the lot of the mother to give the child the greater part of its needed care and training. Safeguarding her children's health should at all times be one of her major interests. Nor should she consider mere instinctive love sufficient for this task. Vast indeed may be the suffering and disease and incalculable the mischief caused by incompetent mothers. They should acquaint themselves with at least the more common symptoms of the acute infectious diseases, and in exceptional cases they should seek scientific aid to help the child weather the usual children's diseases.

Another matter of great importance to the child's health is maternal nursing. There is a living something in the mother's milk that helps the baby digest and assimilate the supplied food. The medical profession, moreover, is agreed that this something, acting as an anti-toxin and a vaccine, protects the new-born babe against disease germs. Studies show both the disease and death-rate to be much lower among breast-fed than among artificially fed infants.[1]

---

[1] *Science*, Jan., 1923, Vol. LVIII, p. 9.

More particularly during the first six months of the child's life is the solicitous care of the mother and the protecting quiet of the home essential. It is then that the foundations for the child's future activity are laid. Quiet and regularity during this period will go far in developing a hale and hearty child. A lack of these conditions will, on the contrary, foster the growth of an over-delicate child.

Yet of great importance is even the whole pre-school period, the six years during which, according to our civilization, the child's activities are almost exclusively centered in the home. These six years are the period of most rapid growth. The disease and death rate is then very high. It seems that the younger the child, the lower its resistance and the less its power to throw off disease. Facts in the case of measles, for example, contracted during the first year of life show that one out of every five children dies. If, however, the disease can be postponed until the third or fourth year, only one in every twenty-five dies; and if the child reaches the age of six before having the measles, its death menace is decreased to one in fifty. But there is the question not only of death but also of the harm that may come to the child through infections resulting from such children's diseases.

Defects of the senses, for example, frequently develop during the earliest years. Until recently many of these defects were thought to be inherited, whereas the light of modern experimentation has shown them to result from the early environment of the child. The alert and intelligent parent will be on the watch for possible defects in the child from the earliest days after its birth in order that corrective treatment may be applied when less difficult and when the danger of permanent handicap is still greatly reduced.[2]

In general, the wholesome physical development of the child depends upon the conditions under which it lives. It requires nourishing food, regular sleep, proper clothing, a bountiful supply of fresh air and sunlight, and a happy, care-free home. These the child cannot obtain for itself. It needs here the help of the mother. It needs her guidance to establish salutary physical habits. Studies abound to-day showing the excessive death and mortality rates on the part of children whose mothers, because of work or for other reasons, cannot give them normal physical care and training.

---

[2] *Child Care and Training* (University of Minnesota Press), pp. 27–28.

It is therefore a first duty of the family to provide for due physical training of children. Normally the father supports the mother and the offspring so that the mother may without interference give herself to the satisfactory rearing of her children. Such is the ideal situation. In fact, it is a right which society should be much interested in guaranteeing to mother and child. The alternative is a high disease and death-rate, and the effects are even much more far-reaching. The entire well-being of the individual will depend very much upon his physical well-being as a child. Health of mind and probity of morals depend not a little upon bodily health. The family, consequently, in caring scrupulously for the wholesome physical development of the child, renders a great service to society and to the race.

Mental Training of the Child.—Besides the function of procreating children and of nourishing them in health and safety, there falls also to the lot of home-makers the task of directing the mental development of the child. The process of mental transformation in the child goes on naturally, that is, by itself. The parents' task, therefore, is neither to force nor to retard this development. Their duty is rather to prepare a suitable environment, to watch over the development of nature, and to encourage and direct their offspring. By virtue of this service the home becomes the great training school of the mind, as it is that of the body.

The basis for this mental training of the child is curiosity. That is the natural foundation for future adult intellectual vigor. It may manifest itself as early as the age of six months. This circumstance offers the parent the first occasion to develop in the child initiative and self-reliance. Now, since future intellectual activity has its foundation in this curiosity of childhood, this questioning attitude should not be crushed; on the contrary, it should be directed into proper channels. If parents, neglectful of the many opportunities normally presenting themselves in even earliest childhood, fail to foster this desire to learn, the child will reach school age with a deadened or withered imagination, and with a mind lacking the active, eager interest that should characterize this stage of mental life.

Already in its earliest years the normal child is eager to know objects and their qualities. The mind of the child, moreover, is then most open to impressions. It is readily enkindled by the first spark that falls into it. Some even contend that the child learns more before the thirtieth month of its life concerning the material world and its own powers than it learns in all its later years.

The mental activity underlying the sensitive faculties furnishes the first material for training. This early learning of the child—of a non-intellectual type—takes place at a stimulus and response level in connection with the visceral functions and with the emotions of fear, anger, and love. It has been demonstrated in the controlled environment of the laboratory that the establishment of conditioned reflexes and conditioned emotional responses begins even before the child is able to walk or talk. Knowledge of the higher rational sort, however, is usually not attained until about the sixth or seventh year. Such rational knowledge is higher, of course, than mere sense perception, the child by means of it grasping ideas of cause and effect, beginning to make inferences, and to reason from one fact to another. Attainment of reason is nevertheless not a sudden change. The ability to reason comes on gradually, reaching back considerably toward the period of infancy, or at least early childhood. With this, as with other faculties, the training should start with the first beginnings and not wait until full development has taken place.

The mother's patient love is of great value in this very first awakening of the child's powers of mind. The views of mother and child will readily harmonize. The mother will naturally strive to implant in the child's mind such thoughts as will prove salutary. Thus, in earliest childhood will the Christian mother begin suggesting religious thoughts to the child.

Then as the parents are the chief authoritative informants of the child in its early years, so too, in later years, should they be a source of inspiration and a stimulus to higher intellectual development. Contact with opportunities for intellectual quickening will depend largely on the parent. Above all, will the enlightening and stimulating atmosphere of a cultured home serve to draw out the ambition to soar to lofty and noble intellectual heights. A dull and backward home will do the reverse. In this way can alert and devoted parents, even after the child has begun attending school, still find a fertile field for the exercise of their parental influence by stimulating and awakening the minds of their children and inspiring them with high ideals.

The parent, moreover, can show a fairly continuous personal interest that is scarcely within the scope of the teacher. Especially can much be done through the encouragement of good reading to increase the child's store of knowledge and strengthen its imagination, and to help it discriminate between the real and the fanciful. Reading will offset the noisy confusion in which the child of to-day must move. The higher the native endowment of the child, the more will it be able to profit by a rich environment. Yet as a matter of fact, many intellectual superiorities are due solely to fortunate circumstances and acquired intellectual resources. It is for the home to furnish the quickening environment. It is for the mother particularly to arouse the first glimmerings of intelligence. It is for the parents, for the whole home atmosphere, to encourage the child's highest development.

The Socialization of the Child.—The child must not only be assured physical health, vigor, and due development of his intellect, but also moral formation and spiritual direction. Indeed, every faculty of his body and soul must to its highest degree be trained and fitted to fulfil its purpose. The individual moreover must be fitted into the social environment of his time. The goal aimed at in this training should be not only the happiness of the individual but the common good of society as well. In fact, a development of the individual that will make for true fullness of life cannot be provided unless the broader aim of social well-being is kept constantly in mind.

A really inclusive cultural training must utilize all the resources of individual life—physical, social, intellectual, moral and religious—to bring about a symmetrical development and a perfect control of all the powers and faculties of the individual, inasmuch as these conduce to his own enrichment and to the well-being of the social group. Such a cultural development does not consist in any superficial polish, but in a process of training that reaches into the very depths of both mind and heart, thus permeating the profoundest depths of character.

The greatest function of the family, beyond question, consists in this training and socializing process. The prime purpose of the family centers in developing wholesome characters suitably adjusted to their particular cultural environment. From time immemorial this adjustment has been looked upon as a fundamental familial task. It is still considered so to-day. In fact, the home seems all the more necessary for this function in our present complex civilization.

The socialization of the child, insofar as it is a fundamental function of the family, is a difficult task. It is an involved and complex matter, and the possibilities for harm are equally as great as are those for good. First of all, there is the question of the child's delicate equipment. It is essential that any anti-social tendencies be restrained and controlled. Then, there is the complex cultural environment to which the individual of to-day must be adapted. All the trivial acts of everyday life influence the socialization of the child; and the effect of that influence will normally abide through life. Again there are the varied and involved mechanisms by means of which wholesome social life must be realized.

More detailed attention must be given these matters in order to appreciate the far-reaching possibilities for good or for evil that may come to the individual as a member of the family group. Consequently a short digression calculated to point out a few of the findings of modern psychological research in child-training is necessary at this point. Without a fair knowledge of these modern findings, the modern parent cannot fully realize the possibilities of socialization that lie within the narrow confines of the family circle.

The Foundations of Character.—Both congenital and non-congenital factors influence the development of personal character. The foundations of character, however, consist essentially in the inherited instincts together with their accompanying emotions. These are the mainsprings of human activity, both good and bad, both social and asocial. An instinct may be defined as a physiological mechanism common to all members of the human race, or as an impulse to respond by a specific reaction to the reception of some specific stimulus. A distinction is well made between the stronger and active instincts that figure as incitements and the weaker or gentler ones that are inhibitive rather than provocative.

As many as a hundred instincts and emotions have been given mention in the past, but modern psychological research has led to the theory that instincts are fewer in number. Many supposedly instinctive reactions are now attributed by psychologists to the conditioned reflex, a special kind of habit. Yet, unquestionably, the emotional life of the child looms large. Hence it is that the foundations for many good as well as for many morbid characteristics can easily be laid during the first few years of a child's life.

Among the first emotions to show themselves are the rudiments of love, fear, anger or rage. At about the third year, jealousy, cruelty, self-assertion, may be found to greater or less extent in the average child. Practically all inherent personality weaknesses will manifest themselves during the preschool years. This is precisely the period during which the family's influence is at its height.

Sentiments and Character.—Sentiments or interests also play a large part in the formation of character. They deserve every attention on the part of parents seeking to socialize their children. Like instincts, these components of character are separate acquirements of the individual rather than the common heritage of the race. They are driving forces in the life of the person, producing enthusiasm, incitement and stimulation, and furnishing aims, principles, and ideals. A distinction is also well made between sentiments of attraction and sentiments of antagonism. Should any two such contrary sentiments center in one and the same person, they produce what is technically known as a complex—a situation to be diligently avoided.

The parent should seek to consolidate the child's miscellaneous instincts about one harmonized purpose. Thus will be forged a ready instrument for the development of the child's personality. The possession of desirable interests is good insurance against unsteadiness and instability of character. The absence of such interests which would naturally serve as absorbers of superfluous energy, tends to leave the original instincts either unoccupied or harmfully occupied. The child's weaknesses of personality, left uncontrolled and unorganized, will become a tremendous power for unsocial and anti-social conduct.

In the matter of sentiments, however, and of their relation to the socialization of the child, it is well to distinguish between those that are inborn and those that are acquired. One of the chief differences between these two influences consists in this that the inborn sentiment cannot be removed while the acquired sentiment can. Hereditary factors cannot be rooted out. With sufficient effort, however, their operation can be modified somewhat and their effect forestalled, and by intelligent training their evil possibilities may even be converted into good. Yet the congenital tendency will ever remain.

Non-congenital factors, on the other hand, are remediable. In theory, at least, they can be manipulated and changed. There is much evidence to show that the anti-social conduct of children is due in greater measure to their acquired equipment than to that which is hereditary. This greater possibility of control over non-congenital influences is a fact that should encourage those interested in the socialization of the child.

Such are some of the factors by means of which the process of socializing the individual can be carried on. They form the raw material on which parents have to work in their efforts to bring about a wholesome adjustment of the child to its social environment. Both the child's own future peace and happiness and the good of society demand that evil and anti-social propensities be restrained and controlled and that social tendencies be duly fostered and encouraged. The methods to be followed in this task of training are many and varied. Brief attention to some of the main ones would seem in place here.

Fostering the Asthenic Instincts.—In part at least, the socialization of the individual must consist in fostering the so-called asthenic or milder instincts. Arousing and encouraging the development of the child's more amiable and humane emotions and desires will go a considerable distance in counteracting any hidden tendency, for instance, to cruelty or harshness, to spiteful, hateful or other asocial emotional reactions. On the other hand, one deliberate act of cruelty left uncorrected in a child may leave a lasting impression and mar its character for life. With the gentler and milder instincts of tenderness and sympathy well-established, the more vehement impulses, for instance, of anger, acquisitiveness, and self-assertion will naturally be neutralized and restrained.

In like manner all fundamental ideals might be enumerated: kindness, truthfulness, loyalty, toleration, sympathy,—all virtues very significant for both individual and society. It is essential that these good impulses be aroused and evil ones be offset. And this should begin in the earliest years.

Disciplinary Measures.—Another means of training is found in various disciplinary measures. The parent, or other individual who disciplines the child must be guided by the particular type of individual under guidance. Thus in the case of a timid or sensitive child any harsh or intimidating measures readily become harmful. They tend to develop an ingrained feeling of inferiority in the child, and to create a shut-in type of personality lacking in all normal initiative and legitimate ambition. In the case of the more forward, however, rules and penalties may become altogether necessary. Even physical punishment may be the only effective measure, particularly in the earlier years. Silent ostracism would then likely have little effect. Whether the discipline be physical or by act of disapproval, it should not partake of the nature of vengeance or retribution, but should aim at inducing greater self-control and at deterring the culprit from future undesirable acts. The resultant feeling on the part of the child should be regret rather than chagrin. A happy medium should be sought between severe repression and over-indulgence, for both these extremes have harmful consequences. Freedom, within limited bounds, should be aimed at; a controlled and supervised freedom, that would leave ample room for self-discipline, is of particular importance to-day, because the barriers of social pressure that formerly hemmed in the individual have largely disappeared.

Inculcation of Abstract Principles.—Another means of training the child is by the inculcation of abstract principles. Concrete example, it is true, exerts more influence over the life of the child than exhortations. Preachments alone avail little. Hence parents must live lives of principle; and thus will they, in turn, through daily contact with the children in the home world, most effectively insist upon the observance of right principles of conduct. Yet the cultivation of abstract sentiments and the inculcation of generalized ideas of virtue, such as duty, honor, loyalty, and a sense of responsibility, should gradually be given a place, especially in the case of the more intelligent children. Principles so inculcated bit by bit in earliest years will gradually form for the child a definite philosophy of life that will be of incalculable value. What is in the child's mind, greatly influences its conduct. If given a substantial mental food to thrive on, the result will show itself in the growth of a wholesome personality; on the contrary, should faulty notions first take root, they can be eradicated only with the greatest difficulty.

Sublimation and Substitution in Case of Provocative Instincts.—Especially will the stronger and more active instincts and emotions of children tend to thwart socializing efforts. Perhaps the most effective means of coping with these factors is to be found in supplying a sufficient number of wholesome interests. These would occupy the children's attention and at the same time serve as salutary outlets for their surplus energies. Such diversion of the lower and more crude forms of instinctive behavior into higher and less harmful interest channels would naturally react to the benefit of individual and society alike. Mere suppression of inherited impulses will avail little because inborn impulses will persist. Their misdirected energy cannot be stamped out. Effort should be centered rather in directing it anew and in guiding it aright. All negative measures, at any rate, should be supplemented by positive and constructive efforts of assistance.

Sublimation through play activity will be particularly effective in the case of the young. Youth has a powerful natural craving for physical exercises and recreational activity. Play is the dominant interest in the child's life. It provides a ready vent for surplus energies and a harmless substitute for lower instinctive reactions. With the child's attention riveted on wholesome play interests and with its abounding energies directed into activities that are devoid of harm or productive of good, occasions for coarse and asocial behavior will be reduced to a minimum. Unlawful outlets will be replaced by lawful ones. Salutary interests will replace unhealthful ones. The provocative instincts will be occupied and controlled. Nor will recreational activities serve only to hold the interest of the young and provide an outlet for their pent-up energies, but properly controlled and supervised, they will become ready material for use in the process of child socialization.

Habits and Character Formation.—Of all the methods that can be made use of in this development of a socialized individual, the most far-reaching is undoubtedly habit formation. And it is particularly in the formation of wholesome habits that we see the value of the home as a means of affording multiple opportunities for the repetition of stimuli. A habit, to give one accepted definition, is an abiding quality consisting in a facility for performing acts. Once formed, a a habit becomes a stable and permanent possession, a ''second nature'' as it were, and, whether in the form of virtue or vice, it exerts a tremendous influence on both individual and social life. Habits have their roots in both heredity and environment. Random movements, reflexes and instincts, conscious and unconscious acts alike, have a share in their formation. Like the reflex and instinct, a habit represents a specific method of reacting to environmental stimulus. However, it is better adapted to human needs than either of these reactions, and in our complex and changing environment such an acquirable mechanism is nothing less than a necessity.

Some habits are slowly and laboriously formed by means of repeated acts. Others again may be acquired by the successful accomplishment of one act. In the latter case, the facility to act already persists, and, if the inclination is bad, effort must be directed toward its control or toward the creation of contrary habits. The latter will help the individual automatically to do the right thing. They will not leave him impotently dependent upon mere abstract principles and rules of conduct when violent emotional reactions threaten

The pleasurable outcome of any anti-social satisfaction should be offset by some unpleasant experience in order that the whole act may represent failure rather than success. For instance, if a child gets a punishment for stealing, the penalty imposed will go a long way in forestalling a habit of pilfering in the individual. The result would be identical in the case of any other vice, for once the idea of punishment becomes definitely associated in the child's mind with the performance of anti-social acts, it will help altogether to deter such indulgences. Repeatedly checked, an inclination will lose its force and tend to wither away. Nothing fails like failure.

The Need of Early Training.—It is generally recognized that the personality is largely formed during the first five years of life; in fact, to a very great extent, during the first two years. In their general outline at least, the results of the first years will remain throughout life. It is also recognized that the environment exerts a powerful influence on character. Given two infants with the same characteristics at birth, different environments might serve to develop in them quite different dispositions. Hence the socialization of the child should begin in its earliest days.

The impulses to conduct which last longest and are rooted deepest always have their origin near birth. It is then that the germs of virtues and vices, of feelings and sentiments, are so implanted as to determine character for life. We speak of the plastic years, and rightly so. The personality of the young child is pliable. The child mind, like fresh clay, readily receives every form that we wish to give it. Nothing is worn, ingrained, or deeply rooted. All students of human nature recognize that this is the period in which deepest impressions are made. These impressions, consequently, have the greatest influence on the whole future of the child. It is the age when primitive instincts can be redirected and modified; when their evil effects can be forestalled or turned into good. It is, furthermore, the age when the foundations of all later developments are laid. Hence, educators, psychologists, and psychiatrists are insistent upon an intelligent use of this formative period during which personality is so readily influenced for weal or woe.

Even in the earliest baby state, something can already be accomplished, namely, by the exercise of physical pressure from without. In the child stage, such influences as pleasure and displeasure, reward and punishment, and even physical coercion, if intelligently applied, can do much to shape wholesome personalities. Various forms of self-restraint can be developed at this period and habits of respect for persons and things formed. Altogether essential is the development of a process of self-formation within. Hence, motives for social behavior should be inculcated as early as possible since without them there is no real self-training. And it cannot be too frequently repeated that self-training is peculiarly a need in our unstable and complex civilization to-day.

It should be noted, however, that the possibilities of early plastic years are equally great for evil and for good. Thus, there are some social qualities which, if not acquired in early childhood, are rarely acquired in after life and then only with great effort and difficulty. There are also certain unsocial tendencies that put in their appearance which, if left unheeded and unchecked, will speedily grow into rank weeds of vice. It is, therefore, of the greatest importance to the individual and society alike that these vicious tendencies be checked and the social qualities be diligently cultivated, in order that a luxuriant growth of virtue may result. Habits of ill-temper, for instance, may develop in a child several years before the use of reason. Left unchecked, they would grow and continue through life, begetting a very asocial individual.

On the other hand, early lessons in forbearance and self-denial, gently and patiently inculcated, can go far toward preserving the child from the development of such evil and unsocial growth. Or again, the young cannot too early be trained to admire all that is good and beautiful, and so to discern what is excellent and noble in everything and everybody around them. The powerful influence of such training towards enlightening the mind and enlarging the heart is incalculable. Left merely to himself, there is apt to develop in the individual a speedy growth of the unsocial tendencies towards dispraise and destructive criticism, all of which cultivate the small and narrow mind.

With the advance of years, the character becomes more pronounced and matured. Yet it ever clings to its first outline and remains true to its earliest impressions. Once strengthened by age, it bends with difficulty. Modern psychology has also found much truth in Milton's words: "Childhood shows the man as morning shows the day." Undoubtedly the child's character is the nucleus of the man's. Hence, social economy and progress alike demand that much intelligent effort be centered on the training of the pre-school child.

Home Influence Paramount.—The duty of early education is so to train the instincts that they may develop a harmonious character, constructive rather than destructive, affectionate rather than sullen, social rather than asocial. In this process of development the child is very dependent upon others. It comes into the world helpless, and so depends upon others for its nurture as well as for its culture. In its earliest and most impressionable years, this help normally comes from the home. Thus, it must follow that long association with the parents and other members of the family has a lasting influence upon the child. The ways in which the members of the home condition the emotional responses, the emotional family relationships engendered, the family attitudes copied, affect the individual's ultimate ability to make adjustments to personalities and situations outside the narrow circle of the home.

The family influences have their way with the child months, and even years, before other forces have an opportunity to come into contact with his existence. To the home, then, normally falls that all-important task of beginning the process of socializing the child, of shaping a personality both adapted to the codes, the standards and the ideals of society and capable of adjusting itself to others. Ordinarily the home makes the man.

In spite of an occasional suggestion that the State, because of the harm done to children by incompetent parents, should in some manner undertake the task of child-rearing, the family is still recognized as best suited by far for the attainment of those virtues which humanize life and make society possible. This conviction holds favor because the earliest and most universal interests of children are their sentiments for their parents. Their most primitive emotions naturally come to be connected with the thought of father and mother. Their wishes, impulses, and feelings tend to center in them.

Family life, then, tends to liberate and bring into play spiritual forces which would remain undeveloped under any other system of upbringing. The small and intimate circle of the family, which, guarding as it does such manifold and deep feelings, affords to human personality a development far more rich and secure than that, for instance, of a more matter-of-fact artificial institution of complex society at large. In the family circle the individuals who afterward constitute society can readily be dealt with in detail and fashioned one by one. It would be difficult, indeed, to understand how anything else could have the incomparable formative influences which attach themselves to that most natural relationship of all, the closest and richest in both motives and experiences.

Particularly do those who deal much with the disorganized and disintegrated home realize the need of the normal family for the socialization of children. Thus, it has become a well-recognized principle of modern social work that children should be left in their homes as long as at all feasible, and should not be separated from the family for reasons such as arise, for example, from poverty.

The attitude of American social-workers toward this problem was clearly expressed in the resolutions of the White

House conference called in 1909 by President Roosevelt. The report of the resolutions committee, which was unanimously adopted by the conference, stated: "Children of parents of worthy character suffering from temporary misfortune and children of reasonably efficient and deserving mothers who are without support of the normal breadwinner should, as a rule, be kept with their parents, such aid being given as may be necessary to maintain suitable homes for the rearing of children. This aid should be given by such methods and from such sources as may be determined by the general policy of each community, preferably in the form of private charity rather than public relief."[3]

This same attitude was reaffirmed in the resolutions passed by the Conferences on Child Welfare called by the United States Bureau in 1919: "Unless unusual conditions exist, the child's welfare is best promoted by keeping him in his own home. No child should be permanently removed from his own home, unless it is impossible to reconstruct family conditions, or build and supplement family resources so as to make the home safe for the community. In case of removal, separation should not continue beyond the period of reconstruction."[4]

These expressions of attitudes gave considerable impetus to the care of dependent children in their own homes. They also contributed to the speedy growth of Mothers' Aid legislation, which should make such a program a possibility. They were, furthermore, a recognition of the fundamental values of the home.

Reasons could be multiplied to show why the home occupies such an advantageous place in the training of the child, or to show why even the security of a harmonious family life, founded in normal love and affection, is necessary for the proper development of personality. As already pointed out, home-training is practical rather than theoretical. Concrete situations are continually dealt with. Again there is the repetition of stimuli, the influence of which at an early age is very great. By no means of least consideration is the fact that the training begins in earliest years and remains practically constant. Besides the intermittent conscious control of the child effected through explicit regulation in the home, there is the regular, though ofttimes unconscious, control through example. These controls are exerted upon the child in a great many different ways. The impulse to admire and to imitate is very powerful in the child. Everything readily becomes for him a model for imitation. These models shape his life and mold his character. The nobler they are and the greater the child's trust in them, the stronger and more inspiring will be their influence.

---

[3] U. S. Children's Bureau, Publicaton 136, p. 197.
[4] U. S. Children's Bureau, Publication 62.

Parents, naturally, become the child's models. They are its embodiment of the adult world. They are its heroes and naturally wish to do the best by their child. The many satisfactions the child gets from them in earliest years bind it closely to them by the ties of affection. And it is, above all, the role of the affections that gives the home its influence and the peculiar power arising from the fact that the training comes from those whom the child loves most.

Studies of institutional and adopted children have shown the need of parental affection in the child's life. They have shown that children suffer by separation from parents, and that their emotional responses are in many important ways warped from normalcy. The feelings and attitudes which the child has toward the parents are later carried over into his relations with other individuals. It seems certain that these attitudes cannot ordinarily be developed normally in later years, if they have been absent from early life. Even the half orphan, no matter from what kind of broken home he may come, seems inevitably to suffer from the lack of normal relationships with two parents. Responses are conditioned somewhat differently to the father than to the mother, so that the loss of either one is likely to bring about a one-sided development of the child's emotional reactions. There is, perhaps, no other greater single element in the development and enrichment of personality than affection, and, if the child's emotional development is to be wholesome, it needs the right kind of affection from both parents.

The Mother's Influence.—The great central source of influence within the domestic circle, however, is ordinarily the mother. Because of the close contact between mother and child, their mutual love has constant opportunity for full play and development. Thus, there develops a spirit of union that binds them together and fills the child's mind with trust, confidence, and respect. This all makes for a cordial coöperation between mother and child, with a willing service as the result. Disciplinary coercion, with its frequent evil consequences, is rather a last resort and a minor factor in the training. The mother governs mainly through the affections, thus cultivating the feelings and emotions, the chief forces in the determination of character. She makes the home world a suitable environment for the child. Through her tact and care this microcosm becomes a refuge from the storms of life, a haven from which are driven all anxiety, doubt, and fear. It becomes a "source of a thousand joys that are dear to affection and enduring springs of noble impulse later." As man's great natural teacher, no one can replace the mother. Guides for her can be given; substitutes for her can be found; but, after all, they are but substitutes. Nor, for that matter, can anyone replace the father. The fact is, father may be even a more potent influence than mother for Junior in his teens.

The influences of the mother, like that of the home in general, may, however, become a power for evil as well as for good. There are a number of hazards that must be guarded against lest they become in the life of the child very real evils. For instance, more frequently on the part of the mother than that of the father does the danger of fixation, or too close attachment, arise. The child's personality becomes so intimately welded into the life of the mother through the exercise of its natural affection that it finds it difficult to develop its own individual characteristics. Again, it seems more frequently to be the mother who promotes the inborn selfishness of children by giving in to their whims in order to win their affection or merely to keep them quiet. In many such ways can mother love become a damaging force to personality. This love must not be bestowed unwisely.

Nor is the father's particular attitude without influence. If, for instance, he is of a domineering type, he may cause the child to develop a rebellious reaction toward all authority. Or again, the child may become timid and extremely sensitive, or a shut-in type of personality. Estrangements in family life may start the child in life with an equipment of antagonism that will color his whole emotional existence. The possibilities for evil as well as for good are tremendous. Thus, in the seclusion of the home, the child may be blighted for life or made one of the greatest productions of the world an upright, virtuous citizen.

The Family and the Adult.—While the home is particularly necessary for the well-being and development of the child, its functions also extend to youth and adult. The intimacy of family life, in fact, remains of considerable importance throughout the entire span of life. As the child needs physical, mental, and moral development, so youth needs aid, counsel, and advice, guided by love and consideration. Even when launched into the world, and when perplexed by the anxieties and trials attendant on the task of founding their own families, sons and daughters may still look to their parents for consolation and counsel. Then too the good thoughts implanted in the minds of children when young will endure and continue to bear fruit even after the parents have passed away. Old age, too, needs the home. It needs care, respect, veneration. The home is a need of a lifetime.

Happiness, a Function of Family Life.—Not the least important among the purposes of the family is the function of providing happiness for its members. Nature is so constituted that the most substantial and abiding joys of life are normally those associated with love and marriage, with motherhood and family life. Many of the most real and fundamental values of life center around the family hearth, and it is both unwise for the individual and suicidal for society to sacrifice these values to ''keeping up with the Joneses'' or to rainbow-chasing, to superficial frivolity or harmful indulgence. Yet, precisely herein resides a serious threat to the modern family. And equally dangerous is the attitude that would make the happiness of the two founders of a family its primary function. That is at best but secondary.

Nor is the family's moral education confined to the needs of the children themselves. Adults, too, derive moral training from family life. The responsibilities of rearing a family are a vigorous discipline, indeed. They make this fundamental institution a training school for those hardy virtues without which a people or society cannot endure. The anxieties of rearing a family develop a man's manliness and draw out a woman's womanliness, lead to a flowering of unselfishness, and deepen and enrich the finer human sentiments. Family life places the greatest possible number of persons in positions of authority and responsibility. It furnishes them with the strongest incitements to put forth their best efforts in life. It provides an interest most satisfying and fascinating.

These wholesome results, in turn, have a stabilizing effect on personal character and promote collective, as well as individual, well-being. And the ordinary man and woman need this formation resulting from natural family ties. They need the home's community of interest, affection, and love. They suffer when they sacrifice for lesser values these finer things and deeper joys of life.

The Family and the Social Heritage.—Even if the foregoing reasons did not justify the claim of the family, still, the preservation of the social heritage of the race would make it very necessary. Our present culture is, after all, but the accumulation of many ages, passed on constantly from generation to generation. Various agencies of society, particularly the church and the school, help to preserve and transmit this heritage. But, in this task, as in child training, no other institution can adequately take the place of the family. It ranks pre-eminent as the agency by which the social gains of the past are conserved and transmitted. Without it the race would speedily slip back into a most primitive form of culture.

The Family and Other Social Institutions.—In the most primitive cultures the familial institution functions almost alone. In higher civilizations, however, it has the help of other institutions. In the latter case, while the home has very special advantages and peculiarly effective resources for training, the time comes when the family circle ceases to exercise exclusive influence over the formation of the child's character. Various other agencies, such as the Church and school, and the play and community groups, begin exerting an ever-increasing influence as personality factors. In fact, among the primary functions of the home is the task of weaning youth from the dependency of childhood and of fostering the independence proper to adult life in the world at large, and of doing so without destroying respect for parents, concern for near kin, or the finer relations of life.

Yet, while other social institutions help the home and gradually take over in whole or in part some of its functions, they can never become satisfactory substitutes for the family. Helpful and even necessary as they may be, they can never provide the sense of kinship and solidarity which a child experiences in its little domestic world. Other institutions cannot get near enough to the child's heart. They are too impersonal. Every child needs a certain amount of love to thrive on, and attendants cannot reproduce the intimate relations which are normally found between parents and their children. In other words an incubator cannot supply the intimate contacts which form a child's personality. These contacts are possible only in a normal home.

So long, too, as variety of character instead of stereotyped sameness is thought to be of value—so long can the informal education of the home not be replaced by the mechanical rule and routine of institutional life.

Moreover, the mother is more likely than any hireling to know the inherited capacities and defects of her children. And the greater part of education consists precisely in developing these capacities and suppressing these defects. Hence, as a knowledge of heredity becomes more widespread, the functions of the home will become all the more valuable. On the other hand, those who have given the matter any thought whatever, can readily agree with the view of Dr. Saleeby: "Anything less like a mother than the State I find it hard to imagine."[5]

SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

1. What other purposes of the family are there beside those mentioned in this chapter?
2. What part should the father play in child training?
3. What faults of the home do you regard as most harmful to children?
4. In what ways do children of large families receive a better training than children of small families?
5. In what ways is modern science helping parents in the training of their children?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, J. E., "Child Care and Training" (*University of Minnesota Press*).
Beard, R. O., "Parent Education" (*University of Minnesota Press*).
Blanchard, P., *The Child and Society,* Ch. II.
Bosanquet, H., *The Family,* Ch. XIII.
Cleveland, E., *Training the Toddler.*
Cooper, J. M., *Religion Outlines for Colleges,* Course IV, Ch. X.
Dupanloup, Msgr., *The Child.*
Edson, N. W., "The Youth of To-day," *Journal of Social Hygiene,* Vol. XII, No. 4.
Fisher, D. C., *Mothers and Children.*
Flugel, P. H., *The Psycho-Analytic Study of the Family,* Chs. VI, VII.
Furfey, P. H., *The Gang Age,* Ch. IX.

---

[5] Saleeby, C. W., *Parenthood and Race Culture,* p. 179.

———, *You and your Children.*

GERRARD, T. J., *Marriage and Parenthood,* Ch. X.

GROVES, E. R., *Wholesome Childhood.*

KIRKPATRICK, W. H., "New Methods of Discipline," *Children,* Vol. I, No. 2.

MADAME CECILIA, *The Training of Children.*

MEYER, O. F. M., F., *Plain Talks on Marriage,* Chs. I, III, VII.

MUDGETT, M. D., "The Development of Greater Sympathy and Understanding Between Parents and Children," National Conference of Social Workers, 1924, p. 280.

National Society for the Study of Education, Year Book, XXVIII, Vol. XIV.

OGBURN, W. F., "Our Social Heritage," *Survey Graphic,* Dec. 1927.

SAYLES, M. B., *The Problem Child in the Home.*

U. S. Children's Bureau, "Foster Home Care for Dependent Children,"

———, Publication No. 136; "Minimum Standards for Child Welfare,"

———, Publication No. 62.

VAN WATERS, M, "Nineteen Ways of Being a Bad Parent," *Survey Graphic,* Jan., 1927.

———, *Youth in Conflict.*

INDEX

Abortion, 173
Actual wages and minimum standards of living, 116
Advance notice, requirement today, 271-273
Affection: a family bond, 5; and domesticity, 332-333; and the little things of life, 331-332; a family resource, 328-329; cultivation of, 329-330; elements distinguished, 6; and the family and community interests, 330
Ambrose, St., 190
Arrested family life, 172-180
Arrested family life: abortion, 173; artificial birth control, 173-180; sterility, 172-173
Artificial birth control, 173-180
Association of the sexes, and the affections, 239
Augustine, St., 67, 80
Authority: Christian, 20; and family integration, 16-20; as a family resource, 349-351
Ayrinhac, H. A., 41

Bachofen, O.S.B., C. A., 41
Banns of marriage, 42
"Bees" of pioneer days, 14
Benedictine monasticism, 69
Birth control: and human welfare, 178-180; partial and total restriction, 179-180; primarily an urban problem, 177-178; reasons for, 174-177
Bonds: economic and social of family, 11-13; of family, 5-24; industrial, of family, 108; of group, racial and kinship, 62
Bosanquet, H., 11
Bowman, L. E., 99
Broken homes, 202-221
Broken homes: death, 214-215; desertion, 213-214; effects upon society, 220; marriage annulments, 212-213
Bromley, D. D., 279
Bruno, F. J., 67

Calhoun, A. W., 53, 103
Cancer, 258
Catherine of Siena, St., 33
Catholic confessional, 319-324
Celibacy, 27
Changed status of husband and wife, 151-156
Changed status of woman, what will the change bring?, 163-165
Changes in urban recreation, 141-142
Characteristics of medieval period, 4
Chesterton, G. K., 49, 70, 342
Chicago, Little Sicily in, 98; traffic count in, 98
Child, the center of the home, 352
Child's health: during first six months, 354; during first six years, 354
Child labor, 113-115
Child labor: and accidents, 114; and mortality rate, 115; and occupational diseases, 114
Child marriages, 232
Child's social development, 299
Children of working mothers, 132-135
Children of working mothers: lack

of care, 132-133; morbidity rate, 134; mortality rate, 133-134; socialization hampered, 134-135
Christian law, and perversions of marriage, 29-30
Christian relations of brothers and sisters, 38-39
Christianity: and altruism, 65; and individualism, 65; an integrating force, 64-65; and social integration, 79
Church: and effectiveness of Christian doctrine, 66-67; and the family, 25-56; and family education, 294-297; priests' training, 296-297; and family reintegration, 306-326; and the Greco-Roman pagan family, 25-26
Church's marriage laws, 262-268
Church's marriage laws: freedom of consent, 263-264; investigation, and publication of the banns, 262, 263; marriage records, 267-268; minimum marriageable age and parental consent to marriage, 264-265; publicity and ceremonial rite, 265-267
Church's moral law regarding the mating instinct, 313-315
Cinema, 144
Clandestine marriages, 279
Classifications of tensions, 184-185
Collusion and divorce, 279
Colonial marriage laws, 269-271
Commercialized recreation and profits, 145
Communication and transportation, and social mobility, 97
Community complex, 70-71
Community complex disorganized, 106-107
Confession, effects upon life, 322-324
Confessional: and family tensions, 320; and harmonious family life, 320-322; and socialization of the individual, 319-320
Conflict of attitudes between husband and wife, 160-161
Consanguinity, an impediment to matrimony, 45-46
Cooper, J. M., 7, 142, 179, 194, 236, 243, 250, 252, 300, 303
Country districts least affected by Industrial Revolution, 93
Country town community, more rural than urban, 102
Courtship period, 232-235
Crusades and the family, 60
Cultural stability and family integration, 58
Cultural tensions, 186-190
Cultural tensions, sources of, 186
Culture and life patterns, 185
Curiosity, the basis of child's mental training, 355
Cynicism and marriage, 169-170

Dancing, 144-145
Day nursery, 294
"Decorative class" of women, 135
DeFoe, D., 11
Descartes, R., 85
Desertion, 213-214
Devas, C. A., 18, 52, 54
Diabetes, 258
Disabilities of wage earners and their families, 117-182
Disciplinary measures, 362
Discipline of the Church, 310-319
Discipline of the Church: asceticism, 315-318; idealism, 318-319; the Church's moral law, 313-315; means of, 312-313; need for, 310-312
Disintegrated home, effects upon children, 218-220
Disorganized home, effects upon children, 216-217
Divorce, 202-211
Divorce: differences according to geographic areas, 206-207; differences in urban and rural

areas, 205-206; and duration of marriage, 210; effect upon the divorced, 215-216; extent in European countries, 202; extent in the United States, 203; history of, in the United States, 203-204; legislation, 279; no compromise with, 307-308; number of children affected by, 210-211; rate variations within cities, 209-210; rates by states, 206-209; recent increase, 204-205; a question of a greater or lesser evil, 309-310; U. S. government publication, 203; wedge principle, 308-309
Divorce proctor system, 280
Domestic Relations Court, 280
Domestic Revolution, 102
Domestic science courses, 289
Domesticity and affection, 332-333
Douglas, P. H., 116
Duties, essential and accidental of parents, 37

Economic factor as a family resource, 346
Economic family tensions, 195-197
Economic family tensions, sources of, 196
Education, a family bond, 21
Education and the family, 283-305
Education and the family: past, 283-284; present, 284-285; future, 285-288; the Church, 294-297; parent education, 297-300; the school, 289-294; sex education, 300-305
Effects of broken homes upon society, 220
Ellwood, C. A., 25-26
Encyclopedists, 85
Engagement and betrothal, 235-236
England, family life in Pre-Reformation Days, 52-53
Epilepsy and marriage, 258
Essentials of marriage, 307-310
Evans, Col. A. S., 54
Evasive out-of-state marriages, 279-280
Exner, J. M., 240
Extent of family disorganization, 199-200

Fagan, B. J., 146
Familia, 35
Family: and the adult, 372; after the Industrial Revolution, 108-109; before the Industrial Revolution, 108; and insufficient income, 115; and its workers, 108-122; and other social institutions, 374-375; and the social heritage, 373-374; and the social organism, 57-71; bonds of, 5-24; Christian, in practice, 50-56; Colonial American, 55; complex, 22-23; disintegration, 75-221; disorganization, 197-200; integration, 3-71; medieval Christian, 23; Imperial Roman, 18; Mexican, 54; nineteenth century, 53; re-integration, 227-376; rural, and the Industrial Revolution, 109-110; urban and the Industrial Revolution, 110-111; stock, 62; tensions, 183-201
Family bonds, 5-24
Family bonds affected in modern times, 180-181
Family disorganization, 197-200
Family disorganization: extent, 199-200; individualism fundamental in, 198-199
Family tensions, 183-201
Family tensions: classification of, 184-185; cultural, 186-190; definition of, 183; economic, 195-197; religious, 190-193; sex incompatibility, 193-195
Feeble-mindedness and marriage, 258
Feudalism and fixity, 59
Fine arts and family education, 286-287
Finney, R. L., 307

Fletcher, M., 164-165
Flirtation period, 231
Foerster, F. W., 304
Fostering the asthenic instincts, 361-362
Foundations of character, 359-360
France, family life in, 51
France and seventeenth century romantic love, 9
Fraternal relations, 38-39
Freedom of consent, 43, 263-264
Furfey, P. H., 144, 147

Gasquet, O.S.B., A. Card., 52
Germany, family life in, 52
Goodsell, W., 8, 35, 154, 156, 204, 256, 270
Groups: kinship, 94, 99; neighborhood, 94, 99; parish, 95, 100; racial, 94, 98
Groves, E. R., 162-163

Habits and character, 364-365
Hagar, F. M., 102
Happiness, a function of family, 372-373
Hildegarde, St., 33
Home: and commercialized attractions, 144; as an educational agency, 352-376; influence paramount, 367-370; ownership of, and the association of place, 333-334
Home as an educational agency: mental training of children, 355-357; physical training of children, 352-355; social training of children, 357-372
Homes broken by death, 214-215
Homogeneity, mental and moral, 65-66
Honeymoon, 237-238

Illness, an alleged reason for birth control, 175-176
Immigration: a disturbing social factor, 104-106; some federal laws detrimental to family, 105
Inculcation of abstract principles, 362-363
Individual preparation for marriage, 228
Individualism, 78-84
Individualism: the Church and, 79; fundamental in family disorganization, 198-199; in government, 83; and modern industrialism, 82-83; and the new woman, 153
Industrial interests: benefits to family life, 337-338; losses to family life, 338-339
Industrial Revolution: cause of social change, 91-93; and country districts, 93; and leisure time, 138-141; and the rural family, 109-110; and the urban family, 112
Insanity, a bar to marriage, 258
Interplay of elements of affection, 7
Investigation, and publication of banns, 262-263
Italy, seventeenth century romantic love in, 9

Jerome, St., *Epis.* 77 *ad Oceanum*, 33
Jewish patriarch, powers and limitations of, 19-20

Lateran Council, 43, 44, 47
Lecky, 30
Legal safeguards of marriage, 262-282
Legal technique, insufficient for marriage, 280-281
Le Play, 53
Leo XIII, Pope, 29, 31, 38
Love, its relation to affection, 6

Machiavelli, 86
MacManus, T. F., 80
Man's changed status, 160-163
Marriage: annulments, 212-213; clandestine, 47; essentials of,

26-30; laws peculiar to the state, 278; mixed, 46; publicity and ceremonial rite, 46-47; and the state, 268-282; unity and indissolubility of, 28-30; vow, 48
Maternal nursing and child's health, 353
Matters of obligation regarding interrelations of family members, 39
McGowan, R. A., 130, 340
McMenamin, H., 211
Medieval: Christian family, 23; home and disintegration, 75; society stable but not static, 67
Mental family bond, 22-24
Mental health, a desirable qualification in a mate, 258-259
Mental hygiene movement, 298
Mental training of child, 355-357
Merony, 184
Middle Ages: artisans and small shopkeepers of, 12; family of, 4; mixed marriages in, 46
Migratory workers and the family, 121
Minimum marriageable age, 264-265, 273-279
Mitchell, W. C., 121
Modern family resources, 327-351
Modern family resources: affection, 328-333; authority, 349-351; economic, 345; education, 346; home ownership and the association of place, 333-334; industrial interests, 337-345; parental impulse, 335-336; recreation, 346-347; religion, 347-349; sex, 334-335
Modern home and leisure time, 138-150
Modern inconsistency regarding women in industry, 342-343
Mohler, B., 105
Mores and social organization, 95-96
Mothers gainfully employed, 339-342
Mothers' influence, 371-372
Mothers who do not work, 344-345
Mowrer, E. R., 195, 203
Muirhead, 35

National Industrial Conference Board, a study by, 116-117
Natural sciences and family education, 286
Near-kin marriage, 277
Need of early training, 365-367
New legal devices, 280
New status of woman, 153-160
New woman: and agitation, 151; and education, 155-156; and industrialism, 153, 158; and removal of legal and political disabilities, 156-157
Norris, K., 215
Nursery school, 293-294

O'Grady, J., 116
O'Shea, M. V., 300
Overspending, a courtship hazard, 234-235

Paganism, Greco-Roman, individualistic, 63-64
Parent and child relations, 36
Parent education, 297-300
Parental consent to marriage, 264-265
Parental impulse, 335-337
Parental impulse and affection, 6
Park, R. E., and Burgess, E. W., 98
Passion, significance of, 6
Patria potestas, 17, 35
Patriarchal Chinese family, 18
Patriarchal Roman family, 17, 32, 34
Perversions of love: and family disintegration, 166; genuine love and the family group affected, 180-181
"Petting," 240-241
Physical health: cancer, 258; desirable qualification in a mate, 253; diabetes, 258; social dis-

eases, 254-256; tuberculosis, 257-258
Physical training, 352-355
Physical versus the spiritual in love, 171-172
Play: dominant interest of child, 14; and family integration, 13-16; and the home of the past, 14; and the training of the child, 15; in medieval Europe, 15-16
Pleasure philosophy, 89
Pleasure philosophy and family disintegration, 167
Popenoe, P., 173, 190, 243, 254, 255, 341, 344
Pre-marital preparation, 227-242
Pre-nuptial years and the development of the affections, 239-240
Primitives, 3
Protection, a family bond, 21
Public health movement, 298
Public opinion and marriage, 281
Publicity and ceremonial rite, 265-267
Purposes of the family, 352-376
Purposes of the family: child the center, 352-372; happiness, 372; relation of family to other social institutions, 374-375; and the social heritage, 373-374

Qualifications of a mate, 243-261
Qualifications of a mate: attraction for home life, 250-251; good character, 248-250; physical attractiveness, 259; physical health, 253-259; similarity, 244-248; striking a reasonable balance, 259; wealth and income, 251-253

Rating desirable qualifications in a mate, 243-244
Rationalism, 84-90
Rationalism: nineteenth century development, 88-89; origin and growth in eighteenth century, 85-87
Rationalization of conduct, 87
Recreation: as a family resource, 346-349; of child in country town, 148-149; of older children in rural home, 140-141; and urban congestion, 143; of younger children in rural home, 139-150; values recognized more, 146
Recreation survey: of Cincinnati, 142, 143; of Cleveland, 142
Relations, Christian: between family members, 30-40; between husband and wife, 31-33; between parent and child, 36
Relations of father and child in city, 112-113
Religion: as a family resource, 347-349; in early stages of culture, 21
Religious and other family bonds, 20-22
Religious family tensions, 190-193
Revolution, Industrial and Social, 91-107
Richmond, M. E., and Hall, F. S., 269, 271, 273, 274, 276
Romanticism in America, 9
Romanticism, chivalrous, of the Middle Ages, 8
Romanticism, modern: and the family, 167-168; its growth, 168-169; resulting in disillusionment and dissolution, 169-171
Roots of modern social change, 78

Safeguards of marriage, legal, 41-56
Sanctity of marriage, 27
Schmiedeler, E., 58, 91, 108, 138
School and family education, 289-294
School and family education: domestic science courses, 289; nursery school, 293-294; private schools, 291-293; sociology courses on the family, 290-291
"School spirit," 13

Selection of a mate, 228-230
Selfish pleasure, a reason for birth control, 176
Sentiments and character, 360-361
Sex as a family resource, 334-335
Sex education: a matter of character building, 304; the part of parents, 300-302; and the school, 302-304
Sex hazard, 240
Sex incompatibility, 193-195
Sex incompatibility: fruitful source of domestic disharmony, 195; sources of, 193-194
Skepticism and marriage, 169-170
Social diseases, 254
Social disturbances in rural sections, 96
Social habit predominant in stable groups, 60-61
Social milieu, 57
Social mobility at its height in the city, 98-102
Social pressure: and the family, 61; weakening in the city, 101
Social stability: characteristic of Medieval Europe, 59-60; of early rural America, 59
Socialization of the child, 358-372
Socialization of the child: disciplinary measures, 362; fostering the asthenic instincts, 361-362; foundations of character, 359-360; habits and character formation, 364-365; home influence paramount, 376-370; inculcating abstract principles, 362-363; mother's influence, 371-372; need of early training, 365-367; sentiments and complexes, 360-361; sublimation and substitution, 363-364
Sociology courses on the family, 290-291
Spenser, A. G., 159
Spiritual relationship and marriage, 268
State's marriage laws: advance notice, 271-273; clandestine marriages, 276-277; colonial, 269-271; near-kin marriages, 277-278; minimum mariageable age, 273-276
Steps leading to marriage, 230-239
Steps leading to marriage: courtship period, 232-234; engagement or betrothal, 235-236; flirtation period, 231; wedding, 236-237
Sterility, 172-173
Streit case, 187-189
Sublimation and substitution of provocative instincts, 363-364

Talmadge, T., 333
Tension constellations, 197
Teresa of Jesus, St., 33
Tertullian, 47
Testimonials of baptism, 267
Thomas, W. I., and Znaniecki, 199
Thompson, W. S., 177
Thrupp, 35
Trent, Council of, 43, 47
Tridentine legislation, 265
Tuberculosis, 257
Twelve Tables, laws of, 17
Types of families: equalitarian, 152; patriarchal, 151-152; semi-patriarchal, Christian, 152
Types of husbands, 162-163

Unemployment and effect on family life, 117-121
Urbanization process, 110

Vow: of chastity, 317; of obedience, 317; of poverty, 316
Vows: a civilization of, 68; kinds during the Middle Ages, 68-69

Walsh, J. J., 68
Wedding, 236-237
Whitmore, W. H., 141
Whole system of Church necessary, 324-325
Wives who do not work, 135-136

Womankind and the Christian relations of husband and wife, 33-34
Woman's changed status, debit and credit columns, 159-160
Woman's employment, extent of, 123-124
Woman's movement, 153
Women workers: and the family, 123-137; and new code of sexual morality, 129; effects on mothers and family, 131-132; effects on single women, 127-129; living away from home, 126-127; number of married and single, 125; within and outside the home, 125-126
Words case, 192-193
Work and family integration, 11, 13

(3)

3-1303-00005-4669

WITHDRAWN

DEMCO

HECKMAN
BINDERY INC.
JAN 97